

AP

# THE LONDON QUARTERLY & HOLBORN REVIEW

*Edited by J. Alan Kay, M.A., Ph.D.*

**JULY 1955**

*Contributors Include*

**THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT**

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES, B.A., B.D., B.LITT.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE, M.A., B.D.

T. E. JESSOP, O.B.E., M.C., M.A., LITT.D.

G. W. H. LAMPE, M.C., D.D.

G. ERNEST LONG, M.A.

C. L. MITTON, B.A., M.TH., PH.D.

---

FRANK BAKER, B.A., B.D., PH.D.

WILLIAM S. KELYNACK, M.A.

JAMES F. MOZLEY, M.A., D.D.

E. GORDON RUPP, M.A., D.D.

C. RYDER SMITH, B.A., D.D.

UNIVERSITY  
OF MICHIGAN

J  
PERIODICAL  
READING ROOM



**THE EPWORTH PRESS**

[FRANK H. CUMBERS]

**25-35 CITY ROAD LONDON EC1**

*Four Shillings Net*

---

**THE LONDON QUARTERLY AND HOLBORN REVIEW**  
 is published on 25th March, June, September and December. All contributions (typewritten, if possible) should be sent to the Editor, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1, with stamped addressed envelope.

### *Contents*

Editorial Comments: by J. Alan Kay, M.A., PH.D.	161	The Work of the Holy Spirit in History by G. W. H. Lampe, M.C., D.D.	196
The Teaching of the Bible about the Holy Spirit by C. L. Mitton, B.A., M.TH., PH.D.	168	The Marian Martyrs by James F. Mozley, M.A., D.D.	202
The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Individual by G. Ernest Long, M.A.	174	John Cennick: 1718-1753 by W. S. Kelynack, M.A.	209
The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Church by H. Cunliffe-Jones, B.A., B.D., B.LITT.	180	The Beginnings of the Methodist Covenant Service by Frank Baker, B.A., B.D., PH.D.	215
The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Sacraments by A. Raymond George, M.A., B.D.	185	The Christian Community: Creating Public Conscience by E. G. Rupp, M.A., D.D.	221
The Work of the Holy Spirit in the Natural World by T. E. Jessop, O.B.E., M.C., M.A., LITT.D.	191	Recent Literature Edited by C. Ryder Smith, B.A. D.D.	227
		From My New Shelf by C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D.	236
		Our Contributors	240

---

## *A Vocation for Women*

Founded by Dr Stephenson, the Sisterhood Order of the National Children's Home has steadily grown in numbers and effectiveness. It is being regularly recruited by women candidates between the ages of twenty and forty with an aptitude for work amongst children, and ready to take the necessary training for the varied and responsible task of bringing up a family of other people's boys and girls.

The Principal is always glad to hear of suitable entrants for the Sisterhood. Any who wish to take up this form of service should write to him at the address below giving particulars of age, education and experience.

## **NATIONAL CHILDREN'S HOME**

**Chief Office: Highbury Park, London, N.5**



TH

I

tri

th

N

in

de

qu

di

si

th

sl

p

in

f

o

f

e

f

e

n

t

f

i

c



## Editorial Comments

### THE HOLY SPIRIT

IN THE Second Series of the 1951-2 Gifford Lectures, *Experience and Interpretation*, Dr Raven speaks of the Church's 'wholly inadequate doctrine and experience of the Holy Spirit'. 'In no other aspect of Christian thought', he says, 'is there so serious a difference between the religion of the New Testament and that of all subsequent ages; for in the New Testament, in the Acts and Epistles, it is precisely the presence of the Holy Spirit which determines membership in the Church and is the acknowledged source of the qualities, love, joy, peace, fortitude, and the rest, which are the evidence of discipleship. In no other has there been so obvious and continuing a perversion: the gift of the Spirit, from being an abiding life "in Christ" with God and the brethren, becomes in popular esteem first a talisman admitting to membership of the Church here and of heaven hereafter, and then a synonym for the privileges which the hierarchy is permitted to bestow, and finally a magical influence conveyed by the appropriate manual contact.'

No doubt one reason for our inadequate doctrine and experience is our sinfulness. We do not understand the ways of God, because we have so distorted our vision that we cannot see Him, because we are not honest enough to admit facts that contradict our cherished theories, because we are not courageous enough to face the consequences of changing our minds, because we are too proud to walk with Him who is the very source of all humility.

But there are also other reasons for our failure. Perhaps one of them is the simple fact that our human minds work most easily among the things that we can picture. Our doctrines of the Father and the Son are no doubt inadequate enough, and they never will be crystal clear, because the human mind can never wholly understand the divine. But we can form a picture in our minds of a father and of the man Jesus, and although our pictures are no doubt deficient and distorted they are immensely helpful. But of the Spirit we can form no mental image, and He therefore seems to us more vague. In our common speech (though not in our liturgies) we have ceased to speak of Him as the 'Holy Ghost', and rightly so, because the old word now has a more limited and particular meaning; but the change is not without loss, for in modern speech a 'ghost' is at any rate personal, and one of our difficulties today is symbolized by the fact that men (including not infrequently those who have been trained as ministers) so often find themselves speaking of the Spirit as 'It'.

No doubt another reason for our failure is that on this subject the Bible itself does not give us the clear definition that we should like. Dr George Johnston begins his article on 'Spirit' in *The Theological Word Book of the Bible* by saying that the word itself 'almost defies analysis'. Then, after speaking about 'spirit' in the Old Testament, he points out that in the New the situation is more 'complicated', and eventually he indicates certain strains in the tradition that are 'confusing', 'perplexing', and 'strange'.

But the root difficulty is that we are baffled by the whole conception of indwelling. Our lack of understanding at this point is no doubt one of the sources of our perplexity about the doctrines of the Trinity and the Person of Christ, but it comes home to us most strongly when we think of the work of the Holy

Spirit. In some way the whole creation is interpenetrated and moved by the Spirit of God; but we cannot conceive how that may be. More clearly (though not clearly enough for those who believe that man is wholly evil and God is wholly other) the whole of mankind is in some manner and degree dwelt in by the Spirit. There is divine truth in the Quaker doctrine of the Inner Light; and George Fox's statement that our business is 'to answer that of God in every man' is the necessary (though often unrecognized) assumption of every preacher, not excepting the greatest of them all. Yet how one spirit may dwell in another is to us a mystery. More clearly still, since the day of Pentecost Christians in particular have been moved by the Spirit. So overwhelming was the Pentecostal experience that those who shared in it could say that until then the Spirit had not been given, as a man can say that until he fell in love he never knew what love was. Yet the exact nature of the relationship between Christians and the Spirit evades our thought.

The fact is that there is no real parallel to our experience of the indwelling of the Spirit. Perhaps we should understand it better if we knew more about the relationship between human beings, for we men seem to be joined together, not only by the ways of intercourse that are visible to us, but by a kind of underground connexion at some sub-conscious level of our existence. Yet even so, the relationship is not the same as that between God and man. 'There is a point', says Professor John Bailie, in *Our Knowledge of God*, 'beyond which our relation to one another ceases to be analogous to our relation to God. How can God be only over against me, if all the good I do is wholly His and yet most truly done by me, and if all the truth I think is wholly His and yet most truly thought by me, and if I am never so truly myself as when He does in me what He wills and thinks in me what He would have me think? How can He be wholly other than I, if I am most truly *causa mei* when I am being most irresistibly determined by Him?' And again he says: '... the indwelling of the Holy Spirit of God in the heart of man is a togetherness of a more complex and intimate kind than any relation that can exist between one finite spirit and another.'

But though our doctrine is inadequate, it is at any rate an attempt to account for an experience, and although the experience also is inadequate, it is indubitably real. Our minds can therefore do no other than continue to work upon it, and we hope the articles which follow will help to provide stimulus and direction.

### ANNIVERSARIES

There is a good deal to be said for the marking of special days. No doubt it can be, and has been, overdone. If every day is a Saint's Day, none stands out above the rest, and Protestantism did well to abolish all special days except those connected with some tremendous divine event—though there is perhaps more to be said for a yearly remembrance of such figures as St Paul and St Francis than for the observance of the Women's Anniversary, the Men's Weekend, and Animal Sunday.

But if days of remembrance are kept within bounds, they are a valuable means of grace. They enrich our communion with the great company to which we belong; they remind us of our indebtedness to the courage, the labour, the

inspiration, the sacrifice of those who have gone before; they encourage us in our own struggles; they bring home to us the greatness of the divine power that is available for weak and sinful men; and they kindle in us a spirit of thanksgiving for the wonders God has wrought.

It so happens that several centenaries fall about this time. It is two hundred years since John Cennick died and since John Wesley held his first Covenant Service, and four hundred years since the death of the first English Protestant martyrs. It has seemed fitting, therefore, to include in this issue articles which mark each of these occasions. That on Cennick deals, of set purpose, only with his life, for his hymns demand separate mention, and some assessment of them may well be given here.

### CENNICK'S HYMNS

There is something a little quaint about many of Cennick's hymns. Sometimes, of course, that is not his fault, but is due to a change in the uses and associations of words since the eighteenth century. The congregations of his day could no doubt have sung the words 'Come, dear fellows' without feeling that they sounded at all odd; when they saw a hymn headed, 'Admiring Free-Love', they would not have been in any danger of misunderstanding its subject; and when in another hymn they exhorted one another to look at the cross and 'Let that Scene amuse thee', their meaning would have been quite unambiguously solemn.

Sometimes Cennick's hymns strike a jarring note because of a change in taste. One cannot imagine a modern congregation singing a hymn beginning 'God hath judged the scarlet Whore', or declaring that they will wipe their weeping eyes with the napkin Jesus left behind in His tomb. Still less could they sing without discomfort:

*Persuade me of this,  
And for the great Bliss  
I'll thank Thee, and ev'ry dear Nail-hole I'll kiss.*

Of this order, too, are the dialogue hymns that he wrote. They are quite unusable today, but in the days when you could sing a hymn about a departing minister in his presence without embarrassing him, it probably seemed less strange for the men and women to exhort each other in alternate pairs of lines. Cennick has a number of hymns of this kind. In one of them, the men on one side of the church sing:

*Mothers in Isr'el, Virgins too,  
Why silent sit you thus?*

and the women on the other side thereupon reply:

*Fathers in CHRIST, we wait for you  
To praise the LORD with us.*

Another is called *Strife in Praise*, and in that one each side claims that it has most reason for thanksgiving:

Men: *Come join to praise, ye chosen Race,  
We more than others should:*

Women: *Nay, we more justly ought to praise  
The SAVIOUR'S Wounds and Blood.*

The men go on to say that they were the captives of hell, that they have displeased God more than women have, and that it was the Seed of a woman who redeemed the world; the women declare that the first person to commit sin was a woman, that it was through a woman the world was lost, and that although the One who redeemed the world was the seed of a woman, yet actually He was Himself a man. The men are unconvinced, and say they still *think* they should praise Jesus more than the women; the women finally tell them to cease because they *know* they should praise Him louder than the men.

When all allowances are made, however, for eighteenth-century language and taste, there is still something a little awkward about many of the hymns. This is partly because Cennick is too little concerned about his workmanship (he permits too many false rhymes, clumsy rhythms, and colloquial turns of speech), and partly because he is sometimes childishly naïve.

These errors, however, are only possible because of the very qualities that give him his worth. The first of them is due to the fact that he is concerned with worship and not with fine writing. And what an essential attitude that is for one who would write works of devotion! How many hymns are spoilt by being rather too clever, and how many prayers by being eloquent! Cennick does not fall into that kind of mistake. His hymns are not without literary effect, but they never set out to be effective; they are not without occasional literary device, but it is never devised—indeed, he seems unconscious of it. 'I wou'd not have any who read these Hymns', he says in his Preface to the first part of *Sacred Hymns for the Children of God*, 'look to find either good Poetry, or fine Language therein, for indeed there is none; neither is there Wisdom of Words to please the Ears of the curious, but only the simple Breathing of the Soul's seeking after JESUS, as Employment for such as wou'd make Melody in their Hearts to the LORD, and be merry in their Way to the Rest which remaineth for the people of GOD.' Nothing could seek literary effect less than this:

*Cast me not away from Thee,  
Though I have foolish been:  
Neither leave me utterly,  
Tho' lost, and dead in Sin.*

*JESUS, MASTER! me restore,  
And speedily to help me come!  
Friend of Sinners, I am poor,  
O bring thy Servant home!*

But nothing could be more effective as a 'simple breathing of the soul's seeking after Jesus'.

His childishness is made possible by his directness and simplicity. As he does not seek after unnecessary literary graces, neither does he waste time on unnecessary amplification, picturesque adjectives, fanciful comparisons, or side

issues of any kind. He knows what he wants to say and he goes straight to the point without any trimmings. There is room in our hymn-book for such a verse as Cowper's—

*Mine is an unchanging love,  
Higher than the heights above,  
Deeper than the depths beneath,  
Free and faithful, strong as death.*

but Cennick could not have written it. What he writes is—

*Away my Fears, I will not doubt,  
I will not question JESU's Love:  
He cannot cast his People out,  
Nor will his Kindness e'er remove:  
He lov'd me once, was once my Friend!  
And he shall love me to the End!*

That is more succinct, more unadorned, more direct and more final. It does not stray up into the sky or sink into the sea; it does not turn aside to mention the fact that God's love is free, because at the moment, that is not relevant; it does not seek for comparisons among things that are 'strong'. The result is that it is much more powerful as a statement and much more real as devotion.

In their content, Cennick's hymns are notable for three things. First, for his strong sense of need, coupled with a childlike trust in God who is able to succour him. One of the best examples of this is his hymn *On the Good Samaritan*. He takes the old interpretation which the Fathers gave to the parable and, characteristically, goes straight to his point without any introduction:

*I am the Man whom Thieves have found,  
And strip'd, and naked left, and bound;  
Wounded with Sin, and near to die,  
I helpless in the Way must lie.*

He is seen by the priest who tells him to rise, but he has no strength; then by the Levite who reads the Law to him and leaves him overwhelmed in woe. Finally he cries:

*O that the Good SAMARITAN!  
Wou'd weigh my want and view my Pain:  
Pass by, and all my Troubles see!  
And kindly end my Misery!  
Large are my Wounds, thy Hand apply  
To stay their bleeding, lest I die!  
Thy Grace as Oil, thy Blood as Wine,  
Pour on, and bear me to thine Inn.*

Here, as another example, is the last verse of a hymn on *Christ the Friend of Sinners*:

*Draw near, my Soul, behold the LAMB!  
The Sin of many He shall hide:  
Seek thou Redemption in His Name,*

*For there no SAVIOUR is beside:  
He saves the Lost, and them alone;  
Draw near, my Soul, for thou art one.*

The second characteristic, as might be expected in one who has so strong a sense of need, is his feeling of gratitude. He dedicates the *Sacred Hymns for the Children of God* to 'Jesus of Nazareth, the Friend of Sinners', and writes his words of dedication in verse, explaining why the hymns have been written:

*I cannot think upon thy Cross or Reign,  
Nor view thy Suff'rings for the Sons of Men,  
But the blest Vision forces me to praise  
The Deep of thy amazing Love and Grace!  
I may not LORD! I cannot hold my Tongue;  
'Till Heav'n I see, Thou still shalt be my Song.*

In the Preface to the same book he says: 'Here indeed we are in a State of Banishment, Strangers and Forreigners, who seek an Heav'nly Country: and if any ask, *How can ye sing the LORD's Song in a strange Land?* we answer, *How can we forbear, when we know what CHRIST hath done for our Souls?*' So he praises God for all things. He sings 'our Jesu's lovely name' because of the incredible salvation He has wrought for us, because of its infinite cost, and because of the staggering love that prompted it. He sings praise at night, 'for every favour, This day showed By my God'; in the morning, for 'his Pow'r in whom I live'; after a journey on earth, because God's mercies are 'fresh and new'; during the journey to Heaven, because 'there our endless home shall be'; and on the death of a Christian, 'For he hath giv'n our brother rest'. Because God's love is the same at all times, His praise, also, shall be constant:

*My Song, like thine Eternal Love,  
Shall still the same for Ever prove:  
I'll sing in Clouds and Heaviness,  
As well as in my Joy, and Peace.*

He asks no better thing than to praise God at all times and for all things:

*O may I spend my ev'ry Day!  
( 'Till Death shall carry me away)  
Rememb'ring how Thou loved'st me  
And hourly singing Praise to Thee!*

The third characteristic of his hymns fits in very well with the second, for it is a delight in heaven. For Cennick, a great part of the joy of heaven is due to the fact that there he will be able to praise Christ more sweetly and without end:

*When I appear in yonder's Cloud  
With all his favour'd Throng:  
Then will I sing more sweet, more loud,  
And Christ shall be my Song.*



He is very conscious that the way of this life is a pilgrimage, and he looks to heaven as its glorious goal. It is seldom out of his thoughts, and his highest moments are when his imagination transports him among the company of the blessed:

*Rise up, my Soul, to Heav'n aspire!  
Where flames the Altar's holy Fire:  
Behold around it wond'ring stand,  
The Saints redeem'd from ev'ry Land.*

*The glorious Throng in Raptures gaze,  
On JESU'S Love, on JESU'S Grace:  
Blest with amasing Favour, they  
Adore the LORD, their Life, their Way.*

*Rememb'ring how (in Worlds below)  
The SAVIOUR taught them where to go;  
Learn'd them the Faith, and dy'd for them,  
In grateful Songs they bless his Name.*

*Blissful Fruition swallow's up,  
Their noble Faith, their joyful Hope:  
No more shall ought their Minds employ  
But Everlasting, endless Joy!*

*Hark! from the LAMB a Pray'r ascends,  
For his afflicted, banish'd Friends:  
He prays that they may share his Feast,  
And me remember's with the Rest.*

*See! by his FATHER'S Side He Stands,  
Spread's (Interceeding) wide his Hands:  
Therein are wrote with Blood the Names  
Of all his Sheep, of all his Lambs.*

*Th' Astonish'd Ranks forsake their Throne,  
And while He plead's their Heads uncrown:  
Their Faces in their Wings they veil,  
Humbled in Bliss unspeakable!*

*Each Spirit to his Fellow call's  
In Echoing Lays, and prostrate fall's:  
While every Lute melodious sounds,  
The Merit of IMMANUEL'S Wounds.*

*O touch me with the same blest Fire,  
Which now their sacred Lips inspire:  
And I like them will join, and loud!  
To Sing thy Mercies O my GOD.*

He calls these verses (we have printed fewer than half of them) 'A Foretaste of Heaven'. He has now shared the feast itself for two hundred years, but we may be sure that he who so loved to sing God's praise on earth will not yet have tired of singing it in heaven.

J. ALAN KAY



## THE TEACHING OF THE BIBLE ABOUT THE HOLY SPIRIT

WHEN THE early Church set herself to crystallize the essence of her faith about the Holy Spirit, she declared Him to be the Lord, the Giver of Life. It is our purpose here to try to give some account of that spiritual vitality, evident in the pages of the Bible, which ultimately received expression in this concise formula of the Creed.

There is one conviction about God which every biblical writer shares. It is the belief that He is the 'Living God', powerful and active, the God of history, who breaks into the lives of men and nations, and works out His will there, withstanding, humbling, punishing those who defy Him, and rewarding, guiding, uplifting those who put their trust in Him. For biblical writers God is never a remote Being, a philosophical postulate from which learned discussion may start, nor is He a theoretical inference at the end of a long sequence of argumentation. He is the Living and Active God, who touches man's life at every point, One whom man must always reckon with, One man cannot escape, One who can both overthrow the arrogant and deliver the oppressed. He is known to man, not in abstract thought, but in immediate experience, not so much from what He is as from what He does.

He it is who brings His people out of slavery in Egypt, driving back deep waters that they may pass into safety. He uses that cruel nation, Assyria, as a rod with which to chastise His own disobedient people. He lays hold of Amos and takes him from his flock, and sends him to speak forth as a prophet. It is He who kindles an unquenchable fire in the bones of Jeremiah, so that he knows no rest till he has obeyed the command of God. So personal is this thought of God that later writers no less than early ones have no hesitation in using the most vigorous of anthropomorphic metaphors to summon men to realize that God is One whom they dare not ignore. He rises up early to press on with His purposes. His voice is to be heard and His presence felt. His hand is outstretched, and His arm is not shortened.

The ways of which the writers of the Old Testament express this particular truth about God are many and varied. One, however, which is both frequent and striking in its use is the expression 'The Spirit of God'. It is unlikely that in Old Testament days there was any precise thought about the relationship of the Spirit to God. In practice, however, the phrase represents the vigorous activity of God Himself. Where the thought of God is immature, the nature and action of the Spirit may seem to us immature also. Where the thought of God reaches higher levels, so too does the idea of the Spirit. In Judges, for instance, when 'The Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon Samson', it was to enable him to achieve feats of extraordinary physical prowess, such as tearing a lion in pieces as if it were a kid. When the 'Spirit of the Lord clothed itself with Gideon', he became a man equipped for daring and effective leadership in time of national crisis. The coming of the Spirit upon David after his anointing raised him noticeably above his fellows as a man destined for kingship. Joseph's shrewd discernment and outstanding powers of administration were the endowment of the Spirit; the abilities which made Bezaleel

eminent in artistry and craftsmanship came from the same source; and, indeed, any notable or unusual equipment for the service of God and His people may be recognized as the sign of the Spirit's presence.

Among all the varied marks of His presence, however, the commonest and most characteristic is that of prophecy, the power to speak a true message from the Living God. When this power came upon a man, there was a tendency, especially perhaps in the earlier days, for him to be lifted out of himself into a kind of frenzy of ecstatic excitement. We need not, indeed, think it strange that a man who felt himself to have become the instrument of the Spirit of God should be aware of strange powers at work within him. Unhappily, however, it sometimes happened that this ecstatic state, instead of being regarded as a possible accompaniment of the gift of prophecy, came to be treated as the essential feature, so that the frenzy counted for more than the truth of the message from God. Still more unhappily, the frenzy was sometimes artificially stimulated for its own sake, when there was no message from God to declare. Even in New Testament days the same danger presented itself in the high valuation that some Christians were inclined to place on the curious phenomenon of 'speaking in tongues'.

It may be that it was this false association of the Spirit of God with self-stimulated religious excitement which was responsible for what seems to be the deliberate avoidance of all reference to the Spirit in such great prophets as Amos, Hosea, and Jeremiah. They are no less aware than the others of the living power of God in their lives, but they avoid speaking of this as 'the Spirit'. Perhaps they feared that if they did so, their message would be identified with the crude extravagances of contemporary religion.

Ezekiel, however, speaks freely about the Spirit as the source of his own inspiration and prophetic power. Some of his phrases recall earlier usages, as when he says that the Spirit 'lifts him up' and 'carries him away'. At other times they anticipate the later, deeper teaching of the New Testament, as when he equates the promise of God to 'put my Spirit within you' with the promise of a 'new heart' which finds its delight in obedience to the laws of God (36<sub>26-7</sub>), thus attributing the work of conversion, by which a man is enabled to love that which God commands, to the power of the Spirit.

Only very rarely in the Old Testament, and then in those parts which appear to have been written last, do we find the Spirit associated with God's activity in creation and the world of Nature (Gen 1<sub>1</sub>, Job 3<sub>1</sub>), and not once in the New Testament is there a recurrence of this usage. Always in the New Testament, and almost always in the Old, the sphere of the operation of the Spirit is not the inanimate world of Nature, but the lives of men and the destinies of peoples.

In the somewhat barren period between the writing of the last of the Old Testament books and the appearance of John the Baptist as the herald of the Christ, the vivid experience of the presence of God, whether expressed in terms of the Spirit of God or in other ways, faded and dwindled almost to nothing. The transcendence of God was emphasized at the expense of His immanence. His dealings with men were spoken of as indirect, conducted through subordinates such as angels. The age of prophecy was thought to have ended. All that could be known of God and His Will for man had been fully revealed, and stood written in the Law. The whole duty of man lay in obedience to that

Law, rather than to any living voice of God. In this stiff and formalized religion it is not surprising that the Spirit, in whom God in the past had acted with disturbing and compelling power, became either a wistful memory of the past or a distant hope in the future.

#### THE NEW TESTAMENT

The New Testament is the proclamation, the record and the interpretation of God's decisive act in human history. In Jesus of Nazareth He was more fully present than ever before. Through Him the voice of God was heard, the very character of God made known, the judgement and the saving power of God released into the world of men. God's Sovereign Power (that is the Kingdom of God) was in Him mightily at work, invading human life with incalculable energy. The healing miracles were only the more obvious manifestations of its presence.

It is not surprising that in the Gospels, where this unique intervention of God in His Son in the affairs of man so dominates the scene, references to the Spirit are somewhat infrequent. It is true that the authors of the Gospels, writing at a time much later than the events they describe, sometimes ascribe the uniqueness of Jesus to the effective agency of the Spirit. Thus the miraculous conception is the Spirit's work; the Spirit comes upon Him in a special way at His baptism; it is the Spirit who drives Him into the wilderness to be tempted; and His message at Nazareth opens with the words of Isaiah: 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me.' But in the words of Jesus Himself, the Spirit is rarely named. Indeed, some have argued that He avoided all mention of Him, and that such references as are found are modifications introduced by later tradition. This may be an extreme verdict, but there can be little doubt that Jesus usually, though perhaps not always, preferred to speak of this invasive power of God, which was so manifestly effective in His own ministry, in other terms. Moreover, when we compare some of the sayings of Jesus recorded in one Gospel with the slightly different versions recorded in another, we can observe a tendency to introduce the name of the Spirit into the words of Jesus where it did not originally occur. For instance, in Mt 12<sup>28</sup> Jesus is reported as saying: 'If I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you.' When Luke, however, at 11<sup>20</sup>, records the same saying, he substitutes the 'finger of God' for the 'Spirit of God'. There can be little doubt that Luke here gives the actual words of Jesus, though Matthew accurately interprets their meaning. Again, Lk 11<sup>13</sup> has: '... your heavenly Father will give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him'. Mt 7<sup>11</sup> must, however, be more original in recording 'good things' instead of 'Holy Spirit'. We know that Jesus preferred pictorial to theological language, that He spoke, for example, of 'Father' rather than of 'God'; and so we need not be surprised if His references to what other writers know as the Spirit are contained in picture language also.

More than any other phrase, that of 'the Kingdom of God' is used by Jesus to express ideas which elsewhere are associated with the Spirit. The 'Kingdom' (that is the Sovereign Power of God) was God actively at work in the world of men. Paul, wishing to express the same truth, usually preferred to avoid

the word 'Kingdom' and to use 'the Spirit'. In his writings, the Spirit is as prominent as the Kingdom is in the Gospels, and the Kingdom is as rare as the Spirit is in the Gospels. The close association of the two expressions is vouched for in Matthew's version of the word of Jesus in 12<sub>28</sub>: 'If I by the *Spirit of God* cast out devils, then is the *Kingdom of God* come upon you.' Jn 3<sub>5</sub> also records a saying that associates them in: 'Except a man be born . . . of the *Spirit* he cannot enter the *Kingdom of God*.' Paul, too, proclaims that '*The Kingdom of God* is . . . righteousness, peace and joy in the *Holy Spirit*' (Ro 14<sub>17</sub>).

The absence, therefore, of frequent reference to the Spirit in the Gospels must not be taken to mean that the active presence of God in His Spirit was less vividly experienced then than at other times, but only that the fact was recorded in different words.

As compared with the Synoptic Gospels, the Fourth Gospel both mentions the Spirit more frequently and shows evidence of more theological reflection on His significance. Some features of the Synoptic tradition are reproduced: the author knows that the Spirit came upon Jesus at the time of His baptism; he is aware, also, that Jesus used to speak of the Spirit in pictorial symbols, for after the teaching about 'living water', he adds: 'This He spake of the Spirit'; he knows, too, that specific reference to the work of the Spirit was rare during the earthly ministry, for he explains: 'The Spirit was not yet given, because Jesus was not yet glorified.' Beyond these points, he emphasizes strongly that neither the waters of Baptism nor the 'flesh and blood' of the Eucharist are of real profit in themselves, but only as they become the channels by which the Spirit enters the life of the believer. There is also, in Chapters 14-16, the well-known and characteristic teaching about the Spirit under the name of 'Comforter', Christ's 'other self', as it were.

It is when we come to the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles of Paul that the Spirit comes into most striking prominence. The vivid certainty of the authors that God is mightily active in and through His Church is continually represented in terms of the Spirit. The other writings of the New Testament also bear witness to a similar faith; but since they contribute little that is distinctive, our remaining consideration will be devoted mainly to Acts and the Pauline letters.

The Acts of the Apostles, it has been suggested, might have been suitably named 'The Acts of the Holy Spirit'. The book is written almost breathlessly by one who sensed the mighty presence of God on every hand, and that awesome, divine power is most commonly referred to as 'the Holy Spirit'. The book opens with the promise of Christ: 'Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you', and the rest of the book is the story of how the promise was kept. Throughout the book the Holy Spirit dominates the unfolding narrative. At Pentecost He who in earlier days was the prerogative of prophet and king is bestowed on *all* believers. The leaders of the Church are men 'filled with the Holy Spirit'—Peter, Stephen, Barnabas, Paul—but so also is every believer. All their lives, and that of the Church, are ruled and directed by Him. He guides, approves, appoints, forbids. He brings the fellowship of believers to a common mind ('It seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us', 15<sub>28</sub>). He is the source and motive power of the effective missionary expansion

of the Church. Wisdom and boldness, comfort and joy are among the blessings He brings to those who receive Him. Men are warned against the folly of 'resisting' and 'tempting' Him; and so real is the actuality of this Mighty Power of God, that when those who lie to Him (like Ananias and Sapphira) are convicted of their heinous offence, they fall dead in terror at their wickedness.

The Spirit is the gift bestowed by God and by Christ upon all who commit themselves to Christ in faith and obedience, and baptism is added as the outward mark of the inward grace already received (10<sub>44-7</sub>; 19<sub>2</sub>). He is promised by Jesus and bestowed by the Father, and so is distinguishable from them. Yet sometimes the distinction seems to disappear. The lie against the Holy Spirit in 5<sub>3</sub> is in the very next verse called a lie against God. When in 16<sub>8</sub> the Holy Spirit is said to forbid Paul to speak the word in Asia, Paul concludes that God has called him to preach elsewhere; the action of the Spirit is the action of God. Moreover, the Holy Spirit is hardly differentiated from the Spirit of Jesus, for in 16<sub>8-7</sub> the same truth appears to be expressed, once by saying that the Holy Spirit 'forbade', and later by saying that the 'Spirit of Jesus' did not allow. This is the material out of which the later doctrine of the Trinity was almost bound to come.

We have already noted how prominent a part the Spirit plays in the thought and preaching of the Apostle Paul. For him the Spirit is God's gift in response to man's self-yielding in faith. He assumes that this gift is a privilege enjoyed by all believers, and he appeals to them and counsels them as men and women who are aware of this new power from God in their lives. Of the Galatians he asks: 'Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?' Behind this question is the twofold assumption, that they had received the Spirit, and that He came in response to their faith. For Paul, as for the author of Acts, the coming of the Spirit lifted human life to a new level, making obedience to the will of God a practical possibility, and bringing to the believer inward springs of peace and joy. 'Walk by the Spirit', he writes, 'and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh.' The tyrant evil, whose power is so distressingly confessed in Rom 7, can be countered by the might of the Spirit. Inward chaos and misery are banished by the Spirit, and replaced by the fruit He bears: peace and joy (Gal 5<sub>22</sub>). This same basic assumption that every Christian is a man who has already received the Spirit appears also in the story about Paul in Acts 19<sub>1-8</sub>. There Paul asks the twelve men of Ephesus: 'Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?' and is aghast when he finds that the question merely puzzles them.

Earlier we mentioned that the phrase 'the Kingdom of God' has largely disappeared from Paul's writings, and that the Spirit appears to have taken its place, and to carry a very similar meaning. In the teaching of Jesus, the Kingdom is partly here already, 'realized' in the life and ministry of Jesus, and partly, in its final fulfilment, still to come. In Paul the 'Spirit' represents the 'realized' element in the Kingdom; He is the 'life' from God which we may know *now*, and which is a foretaste of the 'life-to-come'. Paul actually speaks of the 'Spirit in our hearts' as the 'earnest' (foretaste and guarantee) of the very life of heaven (2 Co 5<sub>6</sub>), that of heaven which we may enter into here and now. The fact that He is 'in our hearts' (2 Co 1<sub>22</sub>) emphasizes that for Paul this was a fact of experience, which we can know and live by and rejoice in.



For Paul, therefore, the coming of the Spirit had three practical results:

(a) It brought the believer into that relationship with God for which man had been made. It enabled him to think of God as Father, and himself as God's son. The words that now sprang spontaneously to his lips, in his approach to God, were, 'Abba, Father'; 'For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God' (Ro 8<sub>14-16</sub>).

(b) Along with this new relationship with God, the Spirit brought to the believer a new quality of life. Peace, joy, life, power, are words constantly used by Paul to denote the effective presence of the Spirit. Moreover, new abilities were stimulated in individuals, and these, when brought into the common life of the Church, supplied all the ministries the Church needed in her work—prophecy, teaching, healing, etc.

(c) The Spirit also made possible a new quality of goodness. Sometimes it is called righteousness; more often it appears as the new Christian equivalent of righteousness, 'love'. This stands first among the fruits of the Spirit, and among all the great gifts of the Spirit in 1 Co 12 and 13 is declared to be unquestionably the greatest. Now that God is known through Christ, the Spirit of God comes clad in the character of Christ, and the fruits of His presence are the 'virtues of Christ'.

After New Testament times, the great minds of the Church had to co-ordinate and systematize what the Bible taught about the Spirit, but in the Bible He is a fact and an experience rather than an item of theological theorizing. We have therefore dealt with this great theme at the level of what John Wesley called 'practical divinity'. J. B. Phillips in the preface to his well-known translation of the New Testament Epistles writes: 'We are apt to reduce the Christian religion to a code, or at best a rule of heart and life. To these men it is quite plainly the invasion of their lives by a new quality of life altogether.' The Divine Invader is the Holy Spirit, rightly called 'The Lord, The Giver of Life'.

C. L. MITTON

## THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE INDIVIDUAL

IN THIS article, for the sake of clarity and simplicity, I wish to emphasize one aspect only of the work of the Holy Spirit, and that is His direct, immediate, and personal relationship with the individual believer—that He is not a doctrine, but a Being. This is not to imply that we should have no doctrine of the Spirit, though it is surely significant that, whereas so much doctrinal discussion has taken place on the first two Persons of the Trinity, there has been so little on the third. There is also the suggestive paradox that, whilst the words 'Father' and 'Son' have for us a personal meaning and an emotional content such as are lacking to the word 'Spirit', yet warmth and spontaneity in religion have always been associated particularly with the experience of the Holy Spirit. Surely one explanation of both these facts is that, when we have finished our discussions on Father and Son, discussions in which it is possible for us to be only intellectually involved, it is in and through the Holy Spirit that we meet and have to reckon with the actual power and consequences of what God has done for us in Christ—in and through that Spirit

*Who*

*This one thing has to do,  
Let all God's glory through.*

In the common language of the New Testament, men *believe* on Christ; they *receive* the Holy Spirit. Now, though we may define belief as 'faith-union', something much more than intellectual assent, yet inevitably into the act of believing there enter elements of reason and knowledge. We, first at least, need to know certain facts—that Christ lived and died at a given time and in a given way, and so on—facts that of themselves are independent of our personal response, like the movement of the planets and the structure of the universe. But what fuses those facts into the glowing substance of our experience, what gives power to reason and life to knowledge, is the work and witness of the Holy Spirit. 'Did ye receive the Holy Ghost when ye believed?' This is a question very different from 'Do you believe the divinity of Christ?'—different even from 'Do you believe Christ died for you?' To either of the latter questions it is possible to give a ready 'yes' without ourselves being totally drawn in; but in our reply to the first we cannot but be personally and completely involved. Margaret Fell quotes the words of George Fox:

You will say 'Christ saith this' and 'The Apostles say this', but what canst *thou* say? Art thou a child of light, and hast thou walked in the light, and what thou speakest is it inwardly of God?

To that her reply was: 'We have taken the Scriptures in words, and know nothing of them in ourselves.' Here our 'yes' or 'no' cannot be merely of the mind; it must be the 'yes' or 'no' of the whole self. It is so easy for us to regard Father and Son rather as mental concepts *about which*, rather than *with whom*, we are concerned, or to speak of them as though in their absence—the Father being away governing the universe, and the Son, His earthly work accomplished two thousand years ago, now seated in the distance at the Right Hand



of Power. But in the Holy Spirit we meet the Presence, where thought ends and life begins. Job and his friends argued at length about the ways of God. But when Job met God, there was an end of all argumentation; there was only the ineffable meaning of the experienced fact.

Bearing in mind, then, this characteristic feature of the Spirit's work, let us consider the nature of that work upon the individual successively in creation, conversion, and sanctification.

#### IN CREATION

'The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' This conception of the Spirit at work in creation tends to fall into the background in the New Testament. But since He is the vehicle of God's universal activity, His work is not limited to the Church or converted men; and since His relationship with us is always and everywhere the same—direct, immediate, personal—we may be aware of it before we can put a name to it.

When our Lord draws texts from flowers and birds, from seed and harvest, from all the manifold activities of nature, He is opening our eyes to a world in which God is always visibly at work. Nor is it valid to object that—

*Nature red in tooth and claw  
With ravine shrieks against his creed.*

Nature does not shriek against a creed that includes the Cross. Christ does not omit the fall of the sparrow from the providence of God, and St Paul sees the sighing and groaning of creation as the manifestation of a divine hope. But whether painful or joyous, the world to which Christ introduces us is a live, purposeful, intensely personal world, a world in which 'spirit with spirit can meet'. And if, in spite of the miracles which the natural scientist has worked with his mighty but colourless abstractions, something very much like the 'pathetic fallacy' remains native to the human mind, may it not be because there lies latent in it the profound truth of the Spirit's personal activity? Keats wrote in a moment of depression—

*There was an awful rainbow once in heaven.  
We know her woof and texture; she is given  
In the dull catalogue of common things.*

But the fact is that our eyes still delight spontaneously in the magical colours of the rainbow, undistracted by thoughts of prisms and refractions. We still speak of 'sunrise' and 'sunset', and not of the 'earth-turn'. The stars are still to our eyes 'the same bright, patient stars', and not the gases and minerals of the text books. Our senses obstinately refuse to 'demythologize'; they insist on decoding the waves and vibrations of creation into the language of the spirit. And this is surely not just self-deception. It is the result of a real difference between the direct responsive apprehension of the whole personality, and the detached dispassionate appraisal of the impersonal fact-finder.

To affirm the validity of the one is not to deny that of the other. Nevertheless, at the point where the Spirit meets us, there can be no detachment; we are

caught up into an experience, and that precisely because we are not just standing aside formulating laws and concocting hypotheses. For instance, when Wordsworth writes—

*I have felt  
A presence that disturbs me with the joy  
Of elevated thoughts*

he may proceed to speculate on the nature of the presence, and his speculations may be right or wrong; but the reality of the presence, its effect upon his own soul—this he knows and feels independently of his philosophical reflections upon it. So St Paul can say even to idolaters that God has not left Himself without witness, but has been always 'filling men's hearts with food and gladness'; and Tertullian, who is very far from being a natural theologian, can conclude that the soul is by nature Christian, since amidst all its blindness and depravities there are moments of soundness when it instinctively responds to God. Though the Brahma of the Hindu is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and is therefore a mere figment of the imagination, yet when we read the words of the Hindu poet, Tukaram—

*When thus I lose myself in Thee, O God,  
Then do I see and know,  
That all the universe reveals Thy beauty,  
All living beings, and all lifeless things,  
Exist in Thee—*

can we deny that he has been visited of the Spirit, that there has been a genuine communion between himself and God, however ignorant or mistaken he may be about the identity of his heavenly guest? It is true that his ignorance and mistakenness will cloud and cramp the experience, and it will for that reason be veiled, fitful, fragmentary, and, so to speak, anonymous; yet none the less what he senses is the living breath, the authentic Spirit, of the Almighty. Thus the converted man, as he looks back to the period before his conversion, comes to realize that, long before he awoke to Christ 'as from a surfeit, a sleep, or a sickness', there were promptings, visitings, glimpses, 'good dreams', of which only now he understands the whole completed meaning. Then also, at those times when his heart burned within him, it was because the Unknown Traveller, who walked with him by the way, was none other than the Master Himself.

#### IN CONVERSION

But whatever hints and gleams of the Presence may be felt and seen before conversion, they can be clearly distinguished from the full gift itself of the Spirit when His true nature is disclosed through the Gospel. According to the New Testament this is something quite definite and identifiable. Whether the Spirit had been given or not could be ascertained without difficulty. At Pentecost the crowd knew that something had happened. 'These men', they said, 'are full of new wine', as indeed they were! There is a new power, a deliverance, a sense of possession, which expresses itself in ecstatic utterance,

and in a great surge of joy and thanksgiving; there is what William James calls 'this added dimension of emotion, this enthusiastic temper of espousal'. When John Wesley is asked how the witness of the Spirit can be recognized, he replies:

'How, I pray, can you distinguish night from day? How do you distinguish light from darkness, or the light of a star or a glimmering taper, from the light of the noonday sun?'

This may seem an unsatisfactory answer to those who shudder at the thought of judging a religious state by the test of feeling; but what else *can* be said? How did the Apostles at Pentecost know that they had received the Spirit? They just knew; they felt the pulse and power of the Spirit within them. Of course, there is always the possibility of self-deception; there is that possibility in any human experience. Of that John Wesley is aware, but, as he points out, 'A madman's imagining himself a king does not prove that there are no real kings'. Our senses often deceive us, but we are none the less usually justified in trusting them. The Witness can and must be tested by the criteria of Scripture; but the criteria are not themselves the Witness; the Fruits of the Spirit are not themselves the Spirit; and when we speak of the Spirit's work in conversion—and we are now speaking only of conversion—we cannot dissociate it from a high 'moment' of Communion, an inrush of joy and exaltation, that sets the spirit aglow.

In this connexion, a legitimate dislike of 'mere emotionalism' may be confused with an illegitimate distrust of emotion itself. If we spurn the emotions, they are liable to take their revenge. In the Parable of the Empty House we are given a picture of the life from which an evil passion has been extruded. The house is swept and garnished—the scale of values neatly arranged, all the furniture of thought tidily in its place—but the strong man armed is not there, and it lies open and defenceless. The degree to which mind and will are directed harmoniously along the pathway of God's purpose depends upon both the intensity and the quality of the emotion that impels them, and the intensity and quality of the emotion in their turn depend upon its source. The fact that a man can be easily moved to an evanescent froth of feeling by sentimental tunes set to bad verse does not mean that he should listen unmoved to Bach's Passion music. I may have said a hundred times 'I am a sinner' or 'Christ loved me and gave Himself for me' and been sincere in my fashion, but what is it that suddenly charges those words with stabbing vital power if not the deeper and stronger current of feeling that the Spirit's presence induces? Great things are not done without the stirring of a mighty passion; and even if it does not and cannot remain at its first intensity, yet underlying all our varying moods there remains and recurs something of the fire and thrill of the initial experience, which effects a permanent spiritual change. John Wesley before his conversion had disciplined his will, and dedicated his intellect, with considerable success, to the service of Christ, but the great change only occurred when he felt his heart strangely warmed. It is this added warmth and enthusiasm that mark the Gift of the Spirit.

But why was it on that particular evening in Aldersgate Street that the experience took place? We cannot say. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth.'

*We cannot kindle when we will  
The fire that in the heart resides.*

We cannot compel the Spirit. We can only expect Him. 'Tarry ye in Jerusalem,' said Jesus to the disciples, 'until ye be endued with power from on high.' This does not mean that we can do nothing. Moses made the Tabernacle; he set it up, and placed there the altar. He could do this. But then he must wait for the glory of the Lord to fill it. Elijah could set up twelve stones for an altar; he could lay on it the wood and the offering. But then he could only pray for the fire from heaven. We can do our Bible-reading, our praying, our worshipping; we can meet together for fellowship; but there is this last thing we cannot do. We can but look up to heaven in faith and wait for the Promise of the Father. But is not this very expectancy, this waiting, this recognition that, when we have done all, the gift itself is beyond our power and outside our contriving—that it is a gift, and not something that can be earned or demanded as by right—is not this just the necessary acknowledgement that the Spirit lives and is free, that His relationship with us is personal and spontaneous? And is that acknowledgement not itself the essential prerequisite of His coming?

*My how or when thou wilt not heed,  
But come down thine own secret stair,  
That thou mayest answer all my need,  
Yea, every bygone prayer.*

#### IN SANCTIFICATION

Where there is real conversion, the inward movement of the Spirit is an impulse to action. He gives the capacity to 'get going', just as the fire in the boiler of a locomotive increases the internal pressure of the steam to the point at which the engine is set in motion. St Mark speaks of the Spirit 'driving' Jesus out into the wilderness. The gift of the Holy Spirit implies the conferment of a task, a responsibility. Conversion is not just a cosy state of mind; it is a 'calling'. Jesus said to the Apostles, 'Ye shall receive Power. . . . And ye shall be my witnesses', and the power is inextricably linked with the task. When Paul was converted, the word spoken to Ananias was: 'He is a chosen vessel before me to bear my name before the Gentiles'; and the Holy Ghost said to the Church at Antioch: 'Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereunto I have called them.' Thus the 'gifts' of the Spirit which Paul enumerates are not so much qualities as functions, and the Church is Holy only as it is also Apostolic, as it pursues the mission on which God sends it.

In conversion, therefore, God lays hold of a man; in sanctification, the man so laid hold of is willingly used for God's purpose. Here too the work of the Spirit is direct, immediate, personal. Even where, as at Antioch, the Spirit speaks to the whole fellowship, the laying on of hands with prayer implies the necessity of an inward moving of the Spirit in those who are sent. There is that 'enthusiastic temper of espousal' in those who are truly employed for God's work. We cannot, of course, limit the divine calling to the commonly

recognized ministrations of the Church. Any vocation, whether nominally 'sacred' or nominally 'secular', may or may not be a 'calling'; but if it is, the one who is called will know. He will know at least this, that it is God's work, and not his own, on which he is engaged; and as he goes to it, he will sense the 'spiritual glow'.

So sanctification is not simply the acquisition of an assortment of virtues; it is rather what happens to a man as he continues in God's employment. When God first takes the instrument in hand, it may be a poor, blunt, inefficient tool, but it is shaped and sharpened in the using. Paul is called to be the Apostle of the Gentiles, and as he pursues that calling, wrestling with the problems involved, bringing each as it arises to the touchstone of the Gospel, and thereby discovering more and more of the unsearchable riches of Christ, can we not see him steadily growing in stature? A man cannot add a cubit to his stature by taking thought, but he can do so by straining to grasp that for which he has been grasped by Christ. The Indian village woman moves with an incomparable grace and dignity, not because she cultivates deportment, but because she walks morning and evening barefooted to the well with the waterpot on her head, and there bends to let down the bucket and draw up the water. Similarly the Fruits of the Spirit are the spontaneous harvest of a life driven by the Spirit's power in obedience to the call of God. Enrichment of character comes, not to those who seek it, but to those who daily embrace the will of God as God gives them to know it.

But how am I to know the will of God? Here we return to the point from which we started. We are told 'Quench not the Spirit', 'Resist not the Spirit', 'Grieve not the Spirit', as if He Himself is already shining and burning and acting and rejoicing everywhere except where a barrier is thrown up against Him, where perhaps there is a man who will not 'receive' Him, who stands aloof and inert, unwilling to be 'moved', to be drawn in, to become personally involved. Perhaps all that is asked of us is that we should know there is a Holy Ghost and not obstruct His initiative, that we should recognize that His work is prior to ours, not an activity that we set going, but one into which we are caught up and carried along. For He is not a lifeless energy, upon which we must lay hold; He is a live, loving Being who lays hold upon us. So it is not for me to ask, 'How am I to know the will of God?'—a question in which I, as it were, take my stand apart from that will. It is rather for me to make what is both an act of surrender and an invitation—'Be it done unto me according to Thy will'. In fact, I must stop talking *about* the Spirit, and begin to talk *with* Him—

*Come then, my God, mark out thine heir,  
Of heaven a larger earnest give,  
With clearer light Thy witness bear,  
More sensibly within me live;  
Let all my powers Thine entrance feel,  
And deeper stamp Thyself the seal.*

G. ERNEST LONG



## THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CHURCH

THE HOLY SPIRIT enables the Church to respond with heart and mind and soul and strength to God the Father revealed in Christ Jesus our Lord. Where that response is complete, where there is nothing to hinder the work of the Holy Spirit, the Church is presented before Christ 'in splendour, without spot or wrinkle or any such thing', and 'holy and without blemish' (Eph 5<sub>27</sub>, *R.S.V.*). To speak about the work of the Holy Spirit, therefore, is to speak of the complete, the spotless, the perfect. And what is said about the Holy Spirit will be very far removed from the empirical reality of the Church as we know it. So it is a wise plan to begin with the hindrances to that work, which must be clearly before our minds, even when we are contemplating the results of His unhindered activity.

Within the Church as well as outside it, there is much to make the Holy Spirit grieve. Men are blind, and resist the leading of the Spirit. All men, made in the image of God, are destined for fellowship with God. But many have not come to the point of acknowledging Christ as Saviour and Lord, and even those who have do not always live as though they had. Although the grace of Christ works in the hearts and minds of all men, not only of those who call themselves Christians, the response to the working of the Holy Spirit is unhappily a muffled and uncertain one. The unconverted heart is a menace to the well-being of mankind, and the deeds of those who do not acknowledge Christ and His Church grieves the Holy Spirit.

But it is not only outside the Church, but within it that resistance to the Holy Spirit takes place. There are some within the life of the Church in whom a transforming conversion has not taken place. There are others in whom, though such a transforming conversion has taken place, it has not been integrated truly with the habits of daily life. There are those, too, who have stopped growing in the Christian life. A certain level of Christian attainment can unhappily sometimes be a barrier to any further growth either in humanity or in Christian living. And there are those who know, formally, all the right criteria by which to judge the Spirit's action, but who cannot recognize the evidence of His presence when they are clearly before them.

There are two ways in which those within the Church grieve the Holy Spirit: blindness and resistance. The function of the Christian faith is to open our eyes so that we may look on life with the eyes of Christ Jesus our Lord. But sometimes we do not see what God wishes us to see because we are blind. If we can recognize that we are blind, that is the first step towards seeing again; but if we claim to see, when in fact we do not, we are shut up within our blindness (cf. Jn 9<sub>1-41</sub>). There is no infallible safeguard against being blind to what the Holy Spirit is showing us, or deaf to what God is saying to us. Only by responding to God can we respond to God; only by seeing can we see. But if we remember that we are liable to be blind to the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we shall be on the alert for signs of our own failure.

Deeper than blindness lies resistance. What the Holy Spirit reveals to us does not necessarily win a whole-hearted response even from those committed to Christian discipleship. Often a resistance to the divine truth lingers in us,

because essential Christian truth conflicts with our pattern of life and our prejudices. We can only act by seeing what we do as in some sense good. So, being Christian, we surround the course that we are set on following with secondary Christian truth and inapplicable Christian exhortation. In this way it is possible substantially to hide from ourselves the fact that the truth thus emphasized is not here the decisive truth. In this resistance we are partly blind and partly self deceived. Only a steady exposure to the truth of the Gospel and a persistent honesty with ourselves can deliver us.

In the history of the Church there is a long and stubborn tradition that the Church is not sinful; individual Christians, yes, but the Church, no. Perhaps in some secret sense there is an ultimate Church which can never be disloyal, having an unfaltering loyalty which it owes, like everything else, to the grace of Christ. But this cannot be the visible corporate Church of our experience and of our historical memory, for this has not been safeguarded by God from falling into sin. We cannot do justice to human history unless we take seriously the way in which the Church itself has been many times a source of grief to the Holy Spirit. There is an anti-clerical and an anti-ecclesiastical streak in the minds of men outside the Church, and some part of it has been put there by the Holy Spirit Himself, because the Church has sinned, and sinned greatly. The Church which invokes the Holy Spirit must pray constantly to be delivered from that blindness to His truth which is a constant blemish upon its life, and from that resistance to His call which actively diminishes the power of Christian witness.

It is in remembrance of these things that we dare to say:

1. *The work of the Holy Spirit is to empower the Church to be the Church.*

The Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is essentially the communication of the divine life to men. It is a mystery that God should have an eternal life of unimaginable fullness; it is also a mystery that in Jesus Christ this eternal life is manifested in the way that is supreme and victorious. It is doubly mysterious that this eternal life should be transmitted to the fellowship of Christ's people. This is the work of the Holy Spirit. It is at once so simple and obvious that anyone can share it; and so difficult to understand and to share fully that the wisest cannot fathom it. The Church only exists as the Church when it possesses or rather is possessed by this divine life. It points to the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ as the means by which this divine life had been transmitted to it, and by which it is continually transmitted under vastly changing conditions. And except as the bearer of this divine life, it has no claim whatever on the attention of men.

Within the divine life by which the Holy Spirit enables the Church to be the Church, He takes the things of Christ and reveals their abiding and present meaning. What has happened in the life of Christ has already happened. To a limited extent this is open to objective neutral inspection. Certainly the Holy Spirit cannot alter the nature of what happened. Yet to enter into the meaning of what happened requires not only objective study but also subjective response to its inner content, and the Church needs the Holy Spirit to reveal the depth of meaning in what did happen. But not only that; the Holy Spirit reveals to the Church the new meanings which the essential facts gather to



themselves, in speaking to quicken personal response in a very different century. It is the Holy Spirit who makes Christ real to His Church.

What is more, the Holy Spirit, on the basis of God's revelation of Himself in Christ, guides the Church continually into new truth. The Christian revelation is at once static and dynamic; given, and yet continually waiting to be discovered; fixed, but at the same time always unexpected. The character of Christian truth, the nature of the Holy Spirit's guidance, is given once for all in Christ; but the content of the guidance of the Holy Spirit is ever expanding, as that revelation is brought to illuminate wider and wider ranges of human experience. The Holy Spirit enables the Church to be the Church by demonstrating the inexhaustible vitality of the truth of Christ in relation to new experience.

Further, the Holy Spirit enables the Church to be the Church by fortifying it to resist all attacks made upon it. The world in which we live is a world which has rejected Jesus Christ; and that rejection is part of human nature. Of course, there is in human nature more than the spirit of rejection; there is also what Christ has wrought in the world which He has redeemed. But in so far as the Church shares in the mission of Christ to manifest the judgement and mercy of God, it, too, will encounter the hostility to the Gospel which has to be overcome. We have had to admit that this spirit of rejection may unhappily be present in the life of the Church itself, but the divine life which enables the Church to be the Church fortifies it against the pressure of a world that needs to be redeemed and that resists the redeeming power.

*2. The work of the Holy Spirit is to enable a particular Church to be the Church in that place.*

Any particular Church has its reality as 'Church' not because of the wills of the people associated with it, but because the will of God for His Church is manifested in it. Here is a particular embodiment of what God wills His Church to be. The work of the Holy Spirit in this is to be seen in worship and fellowship, with the unity, life and witness that flow from these.

The worship of a particular Church is only truly the worship of the Church when it is truly a response to the living God revealed in Jesus Christ in His present meaning for human life. Worship is concentrated on the present God and on the present moment. 'Now' is the time to hear and to trust and to obey. But it is through the work of the Holy Spirit that the present moment becomes filled with the worship of the living God. Of course, the present moment is not isolated, and into it there comes history, tradition, and eschatology—*History*, in that the historic revelation of God in Christ is the heart and centre of the present worship; *Tradition*, in that the experience of the Church of the centuries is made use of in the expression of the meaning of present worship; and *Eschatology*, in that the present worship both embodies something of the worship of the final Kingdom and looks forward to its fullness. Yet all these elements fail in their true purpose, unless in fact, through the work of the Holy Spirit, the worship is a living response to the one true God.

The fellowship created by the Holy Spirit is no substitute for or antithesis to human fellowship. The fellowship of Christ's people is always a fellowship of human beings with one another and with their God. This means that the

fellowship is always a reconciliation of human personalities with their differing experience and gifts, in such a way that these experiences and gifts are not belittled and thwarted, but rather intensified and enlarged as they are directed by the love of God poured into their hearts through the Holy Spirit given to them. This results in a harmony of personal lives. But such a harmony is only possible when the practical implications of Christ's Gospel are being worked out in each of the individuals, and in their corporate life together. The nature of such fellowship depends upon the personalities of those who constitute it, and will vary from group to group. Yet Christian fellowship has a characteristic quality which is the work of the Holy Spirit, and this is to be seen in and through the characteristics of any particular group.

But the persons involved in such Christian fellowship cannot restrict their interest and concern to any one Christian group. If a particular Church embodies the fellowship created by the Holy Spirit then it cannot be self-contained. If the Bible knows nothing of solitary Christians, it also knows nothing of solitary Churches. The fellowship created by the Holy Spirit in any particular Church reaches out to share in the life of other Churches throughout the world, and especially to those near at hand where the possibilities of fellowship are both most intimate and most exacting. Where true Christian fellowship is claimed for a self-centred and irresponsible group, the work of the Holy Spirit is severely restricted. True Christian fellowship is not a contracting experience, but a generous, enlarging and life-giving one. Where the Holy Spirit is continually creating true worship and true fellowship, every other sign of the Church's life will follow. The disruptive disunity against which St Paul wrote in 1 Corinthians is an offence against both worship and fellowship; and we may well ask ourselves whether our hardened and solidified disunity is truly compatible with the inner springs of the faith on which we feed.

The life nourished in worship and fellowship has to be expressed in countless situations in the general life of mankind, and in that life the witness of the Holy Spirit and the heeding of the witness of the Holy Spirit are of paramount importance. Those who are Christ's must live by the power of His life; this is the test of the reality both of worship and fellowship. So, too, the witness of the Church consists in the totality of its worship, fellowship, unity and life. It may be focused in special ways; but these are the overflow of the main witness. For this main witness there is no substitute; and if it is to be effective, it must be the characteristically Christian witness which can only be created by the work of the Holy Spirit. In so far as any particular Church is the Church of Jesus Christ in that place, the work of the Holy Spirit will have brought about, and will continually bring about, a living and fruitful witness which cannot in any way be hid.

*3. The work of the Holy Spirit is to enable the whole Church to be one in faith, fellowship and hope, and to bring the world to the feet of Christ.*

The greatest word which has yet been sounded in the Ecumenical Movement is the call to Mission and Unity. These two themes sum up the work of the Holy Spirit for the whole Church. The function of the Church is to be the means of bringing the world which God has created and redeemed into fellowship with Him. The harshest criticism that can be levelled at the Church

is that its possessions, its composition, its attitudes towards its own traditions, towards men and women outside the Church, and towards the needs of the hour, in many ways prevent the fulfilment of its true mission. When the Church is able to win an acknowledgement that Christ stands at the centre of all human life, when it is able to win a new response of individual discipleship, when it is the inspiration of new attempts (in great matters and in small) to order the common life in harmony with His truth—this is evidence of the work of the Holy Spirit. It is in the fulfilment of the task of the Church that the work of the Holy Spirit becomes unmistakable.

If this mission is to be truly effective, the Church must be one in faith, in fellowship and in hope. The Church must be one in faith, that the dynamic of a common allegiance may be felt in every part. This is not the same as saying that the Church must have an articulated basis of doctrine from which no deviation can be tolerated. Doctrinal agreement is important—living in an age of confusion and unsettlement, we can see that—but doctrinal agreement is a by-product; it is not an initial requirement of the Church's existence. But without unity in faith the Church does not function as the Church, and the work of the Holy Spirit in producing this is urgently necessary.

The Church must also be one in fellowship. No one is likely to disagree with this in principle. There is one Christ and there is one people of Christ. Christ cannot be divided, and those who belong to Him are indissolubly one. All the metaphors used in the New Testament to describe the relation between Christ and His people presuppose this unity. The Church is the body and Christ the head of the body; the Church is the Bride and Christ the Bridegroom; the Church is the people of God and Christ their Saviour; the Church is the branches and Christ the Vine; the Church consists of living stones and Christ is the Temple in which true worship is offered. All these metaphors presuppose that Christ's people are one in fellowship and that no barriers exist between them.

But when we turn to contemplate the life of the Church in history and in the contemporary scene, we are appalled at the gulf between principle and empirical reality. The two major breaches in the fellowship of the Church are the split between East and West, which formally occurred in 1054 but whose roots are in the early centuries, and the disruption of the Western Church into Protestants and Roman Catholics. No one can easily say that these breaches in fellowship can be quickly healed. But we are growing more ashamed that, in a divided world, we who are in Christ are also divided, and we are more conscious of how much we need the work of the Holy Spirit to make the Church one in fellowship. That oneness of the Church which it is the work of the Holy Spirit to create is, of course, no unworthy unity, but one determined by the essential nature of the Gospel, and we must all long for it and work for it. The Church is set to witness to the true oneness of life in Christ.

And the Church must also be one in hope. The Church's hope is centred in Christ—a hope that is not only for those who are conscious that they belong to Christ, but also for those who belong to Christ though they know it not. This hope is concerned with present duty to Christ and His promise to His people; it is concerned also with the fullest coming of God's Kingdom in this world of space and time, and with the coming of the final Kingdom of God

that transcends both our expectations and our imaginations. Such a hope witnesses, not only to Christians but also to those who are immersed in the despairs and hopes of the world, that amid the complexity and difficulty of political and social decisions men should trust in the living God. Only as the Church is alive in its true hope, can it fully function as the Church; and only by the work of the Holy Spirit can the Church be renewed in the living reality of its hope.

For the Church must at all times seek not to grieve the Holy Spirit; but to be empowered by Him to fulfil its life.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES

---

## THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE SACRAMENTS

### INTRODUCTION

THE HOLY SPIRIT is linked, in the New Testament, with every aspect of the Christian life. To have the Spirit is an essential part of belonging to Christ, being made free, being a son of God, walking after the spirit (Ro 8<sub>1-15</sub>); indeed, 'no man can say, Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit' (1 Co 12<sub>3</sub>). Similarly in the Johannine writings it is essential to be born of the Spirit (Jn 3<sub>5</sub>; cf. 1 Jn 3<sub>24</sub>, 4<sub>2</sub>); and the Paraclete, the Holy Spirit, is described as One who will teach the disciples, bring to their remembrance all that Christ said, and glorify Christ, 'for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you' (Jn 16<sub>14</sub>; cf. 14<sub>26</sub>). It is not too much to say that the Spirit is the Agent of salvation in all its aspects, as Christ is also.

This was one of the considerations which led, very properly, to the subsequent formulation of the doctrine that the Persons of the Trinity co-operate in all their functions in relation to the world. Nevertheless their functions are distinguishable; and just as the work of Christ is plainly distinguishable from that of the Father, so the work of the Spirit is distinguishable from that of Christ. The function of the Spirit is not indeed to draw attention to Himself, but to point to Christ. He effaces Himself as He does His work. Nevertheless, we are not altogether unable to discern His operation within the life of the Church.

But the fact that the Spirit is so closely linked with the life of the Christian raises the question whether it is proper to invoke the presence of the Spirit at all, except at the very beginning of the Christian life. If He is continually at work in the heart of the Christian, what is the point of asking Him to come? The frequency with which His presence is invoked in the later life of the Church serves only to underline the silence of the New Testament about any

such practice. It may be said that those who already have the Spirit may pray to receive Him in fuller measure; and this may be supported by an incident in which those who had already received the Spirit were described as being filled with the Spirit on a subsequent occasion, presumably because they then received Him in fuller measure. But against this it has been powerfully argued by Mr J. G. Davies, in a stimulating recent book which vitally affects this whole subject, that as the Holy Spirit is a Person, it is impossible to receive more or less of Him quantitatively. He therefore concludes that Acts 4<sub>31</sub> is a doublet of Pentecost, a view which is often held on other grounds also.<sup>1</sup> A reply might perhaps be made that, even if the passage is a doublet, the author of Acts perceived no difficulty in thus using it; we might argue that a biblical passage ought not to be interpreted in the light of such an *a priori* principle; moreover, we read of certain men being full of the Spirit (e.g. Ac 6<sub>3, 5</sub>), presumably because they were more so than others. We note also that Mr Davies says: 'It is indeed possible to speak of having greater or less union with a person, but certainly not of having more or less of him'.<sup>2</sup> It may well be that, when we invoke the Spirit, we are not implying that hitherto He has held back part of Himself, which we certainly cannot ascribe to Him, but rather that we are asking that we may have a fuller communion with Him whom we already possess; otherwise there would seem little point in such prayers as the Apostolic Benediction (2 Co 13<sub>14</sub>). Nevertheless we do well to heed the warning not to speak too freely of invoking the Spirit.

#### BAPTISM

As the two sacraments of the Gospel are intimately linked with the Christian life, we should expect to find that the Spirit plays a large part in them. First comes baptism, the sacrament of entry. Christian baptism was first foretold by John the Baptist, who himself baptized with water, but spoke of One who would baptize with the Holy Spirit (Mk 1<sub>8</sub>). The baptism of Jesus Himself by John was marked by the descent of the Spirit (Mk 1<sub>9-11</sub> and parallels). Jesus did not indeed, as far as we know, baptize with water (Jn 4<sub>1-2</sub>), but on the day of Pentecost Peter made the 'appeal' of the first Christian sermon in these words:

Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Ac 2<sub>38</sub>).

A large number of people were thus baptized, according to the scriptural account, apparently that very day (Ac 2<sub>41</sub>). Moreover, the fact that the Holy Spirit had already fallen on Cornelius and his friends was regarded as a reason for administering baptism, not for dispensing with it (Ac 10<sub>47</sub>).

Some of the main Pauline passages on baptism (notably Ro 6<sub>1-4</sub>) make no reference to the Spirit, but there are nevertheless some clear references to the connexion between them in Paul's letters, notably in the words: 'in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body' (1 Co 12<sub>13</sub>; cf. 1 Co 6<sub>11</sub>; Eph 4<sub>4-5</sub>); we must also count the passages where Paul uses the word 'seal', by which he almost



certainly referred to baptism (2 Co 1<sub>21-2</sub>; Eph 1<sub>13-14</sub>, 4<sub>30</sub>). The principal Johannine reference to baptism emphatically connects it with the Spirit:

Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God (Jn 3<sub>5</sub>; cf. 1 Jn 5<sub>6-8</sub>).

Almost all commentators, whatever other allusions they may see in it, take this to be a reference to baptism; there is a similar link between washing, regeneration and the Holy Spirit in Tit 3<sub>5</sub>.

There are, of course, other passages in the New Testament which refer to entry into the Christian life without explicit reference either to the Spirit or to baptism. The Christian receives the remission of his sins and is justified; he is born anew, and created anew, and becomes a child of God; he is sanctified; he has fellowship with Christ; he is received into the people of God, the Messianic community, the bride of Christ; he becomes part of the temple of God, a member of the Body of Christ; he becomes part of a royal priesthood; he dies and rises with Christ; he is translated into the age to come. All these things are so linked that, whether it is explicitly stated or not, they are wrought by the Father through Jesus Christ, who died and rose again to make them possible, and who is the Head of that new community to which many of them refer. Equally, they are all wrought by the Spirit, who is the Agent of the whole process. Baptism is the effective sign through which all this is done; though it is, of course, equally true to say that it is all done by grace through faith. The New Testament does not see here the contradictions which we are apt to imagine. We should 'think of baptism as the *kerygma in action*',<sup>3</sup> and there is no opposition between baptism and faith; in the new Testament 'baptism and faith are but the outside and the inside of the same thing'.<sup>4</sup> Whatever therefore we ascribe to faith we may with confidence ascribe to baptism also.

It is true that an attempt has been made by what has been called the Mason-Dix school of thought in the Anglican Church to associate the reception of the Spirit not with baptism but with the imposition of hands or chrism or confirmation; and there are a few passages of scripture which lend some support to this, chiefly Acts 8<sub>14-17</sub>, 19<sub>6</sub>. But though there may have been some diversity of practice, the passages already cited point in the other direction; and Professor Lampe has shown that the same is true of the evidence of the Fathers.<sup>5</sup>

The administration of baptism to infants raises various questions, especially when the Mason-Dix view is rejected. 'When an infant is baptized, he is received into the new Israel of God',<sup>6</sup> in which these blessings are at work, but 'he does not always or inevitably claim his inheritance'.<sup>7</sup> At best, he does not in his infancy receive the Holy Spirit consciously, and any account of the benefits which he receives must be very carefully qualified. On the other hand, there is no reason at all to suppose that it is not until his adolescence that he can be said to receive the Holy Spirit.

In the New Testament, however, which is concerned primarily, at least, with adults, baptism is closely connected with entry on the Christian life, and thus with the reception of the Spirit. There are indeed operations of the Spirit outside the Christian life. We need not take the references to the spirit in the Old Testament to refer to anything or any Person other than the Holy Spirit,

though that was not known to their authors. But it is only in Christians, as it is only after Pentecost (apart from Christ Himself), that the Spirit comes to abide and to indwell. It might therefore be thought that baptism would be the most appropriate occasion, indeed the only appropriate occasion, to invoke the Spirit. In most baptismal liturgies, however, the Spirit is not addressed, nor is the Father asked in so many words to send Him. A typical petition to the Father is 'wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost'.<sup>8</sup> The present Methodist services have rather scanty references.

#### THE LORD'S SUPPER

The other sacrament of the Gospel is the sacrament of continuance in the Christian life. The New Testament does not explicitly link this with the Holy Spirit as it does baptism; we can merely conclude that as the whole Christian life is lived in the Spirit, therefore the Spirit is operative at the Holy Communion also. Moreover, controversy about the Eucharist has largely concerned the element of sacrifice and the mode of the presence of Christ. A prominent feature, however, in many liturgies is the Epiclesis, or Invocation of the Spirit, though in fact this usually takes the form of a prayer to the Father to send the Spirit.

The tangled history of the Epiclesis may be briefly summarized as follows. In the primitive Church the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was not fully developed, and there was no Epiclesis. But the Epiclesis gradually developed in the East and came to be associated with the idea that the Spirit effects the consecration of the elements and that the Epiclesis marks the moment of the consecration, though perhaps the Eastern Church was never as interested in fixing the precise moment of consecration as was the Western Church, which fixed it at the Words of Institution. The earlier forms of the Eastern Epiclesis ask that the Spirit may descend upon the elements; the later forms mention 'us' as well as the elements, but do not emphasize the addition. A typical example of the later kind is the Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom, still used by the Eastern Orthodox churches:

We . . . implore thee, send down thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon the gifts here set forth, and make this bread the precious body of thy Christ.<sup>9</sup>

The Roman Mass has no Epiclesis, though it is sometimes argued that it once had. Nor have the Anglican books, though there was a faint reminiscence of it in the short-lived book of 1549. Nor have the Methodist books, but it is well-known that Charles Wesley, with his extensive knowledge of the Fathers, supplied the omission by hymns directly invoking the Spirit. Thus the Spirit is invoked on the elements in the hymn that begins:

*Come, Holy Ghost, thine influence shed,  
And realize the sign,  
Thy life infuse into the bread,  
Thy power into the wine.<sup>10</sup>*



Dr J. E. Rattenbury, who was probably the first to point this out, referred also to the hymn 'Come, Thou everlasting Spirit',<sup>11</sup> and said that such a prayer for power to realize the Passion and Death of Christ must not be confused with the Epiclesis; and it is true that it does not completely contain the ideas which the Epiclesis expresses. Yet it is reminiscent of that clause in the later forms of the Epiclesis which invokes the Spirit on 'us'. Moreover, the very ancient Epiclesis in *Apostolic Constitutions*, VIII.12, which actually refers only to the elements, describes the Spirit as 'the Witness of the Lord Jesus' sufferings'. The idea is roughly Johannine, but the actual formula is not, and we may well believe that Wesley, who had used the word 'sufferings' in the first verse, had this very liturgy in mind when he continued:

*Come, thou witness of his dying,  
Come, remembrancer divine,  
Let us feel thy power applying  
Christ to every soul, and mine.*

Most modern liturgies and revisions, though not the Methodist, contain an Epiclesis, usually of the later form.

Nevertheless, the tradition is open to question. The prayer for the Spirit to descend upon 'us' ignores the fact that He already dwells in us as baptized and believing Christians. It is probably to a Protestant the more congenial of the two parts of the Epiclesis, but it is later than the other, and is probably the product of an age when the sense of the indwelling Spirit was beginning to be lost. The prayer for the Spirit to descend upon the elements is uncongenial to those who see difficulty in invoking any kind of blessing on an inanimate object, but others also will feel a difficulty in the fact that such a prayer emphasizes the activity of the Spirit in the Eucharist at the expense of that of Christ, who is made to appear as a kind of passive Victim. The precise definition of the active part which Christ plays in the Eucharist depends on other aspects of eucharistic theology, but clearly He does play some active part. So also does the Spirit, and the difficulties which the traditional forms of the Epiclesis are seen to raise do not exempt us from the task of finding some way of expressing in the Great Prayer the part which the Holy Spirit does play. The prayer will naturally proceed through three stages: first, the mighty acts of God in creation and under the old covenant; second, the mighty acts of God in redemption, that is in Christ under the new covenant, including the Words of Institution; third, the work of the Holy Spirit as the Agent of our salvation, who brings Christ to us and us to Christ. To quote Mr J. G. Davies:

That the Holy Spirit is the creative ground of Christian experience will remain a barren intellectual formula until it is given its rightful emphasis in the worship of the Church.<sup>12</sup>

To this, even though we may not accept all that in his book precedes it, we may gladly assent. There is no need to press the objections to the invocation of the Spirit so rigidly as to exclude such expressions as Wesley's hymns contain; they may be defended by the principle mentioned in our introduction,

that, when we ask the Holy Spirit to descend, we are really asking that we may have a fuller communion with Him whom we already possess. But any new Great Prayer might well avoid these objections. We venture to suggest that the third part of such a prayer might well begin: 'And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to grant that by the operation of thy Holy Spirit . . .' The end of such a sentence cannot be formulated till other questions are settled, but possibly, using a phrase now found *before* the Words of Institution, it might continue, 'we may be partakers of Christ's most blessed Body and Blood, who . . .', and then would come some reference to the present activity of Christ.

## CONCLUSION

There are five other rites sometimes called sacraments, but as they are not recognized as sacraments by Protestants, they do not in themselves concern us here. Nevertheless we do practise some of them as ordinances of the Church, and these raise analogous problems. We have already touched on the question of confirmation; when excessive claims for it are denied, something yet remains, of which in Methodism the public reception of new members is the equivalent; and about the form of this much thought is needed. Ordination also is a rite which concerns entry upon a certain status, and like all such rites other than baptism, it raises the question of the propriety of invoking the Spirit. The Methodist service follows a widespread custom in including a translation of the hymn *Veni, Creator Spiritus* (which also raises the question of the observance of Whitsuntide); and it also contains the important words: 'Mayest thou receive the Holy Spirit for the office and work of a Christian Minister and Pastor'. The theological discussion of this lies outside the scope of this article. Enough, we hope, has been written to dispel the idea sometimes found that sacramental religion is in any way opposed to or divorced from the religion of the Spirit.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

<sup>1</sup> J. G. Davies, *The Spirit, the Church, and the Sacraments* (London, 1954), pp.8-9, 26-8. If this argument is sound, it must modify what I have written in my *Communion with God in the New Testament* (London, 1953), pp.127-8, and in *An Approach to Christian Doctrine* (ed. G. P. Lewis, London, 1954), p.126.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p.9.

<sup>3</sup> W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* (London, 1948), p.123.

<sup>4</sup> J. Denney, *The Death of Christ* (London, 1902), p.185, cited in W. F. Flemington, *loc. cit.*

<sup>5</sup> *The Seal of the Spirit* (London, 1951).

<sup>6</sup> Statement on Holy Baptism in *Minutes of the Methodist Conference*, 1952, p.228.

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *The Sunday Service of the Methodists* (ed. 4, London, 1792), p.143 (infants); cf. p.147 (adults).

<sup>9</sup> Conveniently accessible in *Venite Adoremus I* (ed. 2, Geneva, 1951), p.262.

<sup>10</sup> John Wesley and Charles Wesley, *Hymns on the Lord's Supper*, LXXII; in the present *Methodist Hymn-book*, 767.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*, XVI (cf. VII); now 765; J. E. Rattenbury, *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley* (London, 1948), p.27.

<sup>12</sup> *op. cit.*, p.141; cf. pp.136-40; G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London, 1945), pp. 275-96; J. E. L. Oulton, *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit* (London, 1951), pp.131-40.

# THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE NATURAL WORLD

## I. SOME PRELIMINARY DISTINCTIONS

WHEN OUR concern is with the work of the Spirit in the life of the individual Christian and of the Church, we are obviously thinking of a new and unique dispensation of divine grace, and are identifying the Spirit with that influence that came upon the original Christian community soon after our Lord's exaltation. We are then making a double distinction, the one between the regular operations of God in the natural system of matter and mind and His operations by grace, and the other, within that one, between God's operations by grace before the exaltation of Christ and those after it. If for the purpose of this article I were to identify the Holy Spirit with all the outward activity of God (sometimes the O.T. sense), my task would be too large. I shall therefore consider the Spirit as God's activity in general grace, distinguishing it from His activity in creation and sustentation on the one hand, and on the other from His activity in or through the ascended Christ. My task will be to survey the evidences of such an order of grace within the natural, and to touch on the problem of how the first order could enter into the second without dislocating it.

Immediately, we strike against the stumbling-block of the definition of the natural. In some quarters any attempt at definition would be deprecated, on the ground that any sharp conceptual separation of the natural and the supernatural exposes us to the danger of falling into deism. In other quarters it would be urged that not to separate them would push us into pantheism. The first danger may be avoided by admitting, as both permitted by logic and warranted by experience, that objects that are conceptually distinct may nevertheless be closely together in existence. The second danger, which is more shocking, must be met frontally by a refusal to blur the difference between a lump of matter and God, between the motion of the stars and the *fiat* of its Author, between an event like a man's catching a cold and his conversion or sanctification. Luckily, what we have to define is not a term or an idea but a fact, the given world. Its most obvious feature is that it is in space and time, or perhaps that these are in it; certainly that these are *factors* in its structure and activities. Secondly, its stuff has elementary properties from which other properties follow, and follow regularly (I must ignore apparent exceptions, and the doctrine of 'indeterminacy' in atomic physics). We may say that this world, including finite minds, is natural so far as the description of its patterns and events requires us to use such terms only as space, time, and uniform causation; or, in religious language, so far as it consists of, or follows from, its original created properties and relations. The definition may not be adequate, but it is good enough to enable us to proceed to our proper question.

The question is whether we can detect within this world, as so conceived, any signs of God's general grace, which I shall take to mean God's benevolence to man, to the race as such. This is the only way, within a brief compass, in which I can turn the subject assigned to me into a question that is at once clear and capable of being brought into confrontation with the world of natural

fact. I have reduced the preliminary pedantry to the minimum required to extract such a question. If the distinction between the natural and the supernatural be rejected, or if it be held that there is no divine grace except that mediated by the historic Jesus, then *cadit quaestio*; since on the first of these positions there is no natural world, and on the second there is no work of the Spirit, in any sense that includes grace, within the strictly natural world.

## II. THE MATERIAL WORLD

The inanimate part of the material world is that which behaves without either an *experienced* impulse or a *foreseen* end. It has no mind in it in the way in which an animal or a man has; so that to regard it, as some pantheists have done, as God's body is to romp away from the analogy of experience, as well as to be religiously crass. Does this mindless part of the universe nevertheless show signs of a divine grace? We are not seeking a *proof* of a cosmic grace, and thereby of God, but are assuming that divine grace is known independently, in a religious man's experience of himself, and are asking whether we can use it as a clue to the understanding of anything in the material cosmos. The idea of God as ultimate and superlative power enables us to bring in the illuminating notion of creation, and the idea of God as superlative intellect gives us a ground for the world's systematic unity of vastness, variety and intricacy; but where is the idea of God as grace applicable?

Grace must mean for us a graciousness toward man. If we can find it in the material world we shall come very near to the old view, nowadays contemptuously dismissed, that the world was made for man, that man is its *raison d'être*. This view is doubtless beyond both proof and disproof. The current dismissal of it springs more from a cast of mind than from the detection of evidence against it. One of the few reasons offered is that something so big and lasting as the material universe cannot be all for the sake of something so small, so recent, and so ephemeral as man—assuming as axiomatic a spatio-temporal criterion of importance which no religious mind can accept. Granting that it is hard to see how the stars are relevant to man (except as guides in navigation), we might be content to claim the sun, the moon, and this good earth as having been devised to provide the conditions of man's emergence and survival, and not of his *esse* only, but also to some extent of his *bene esse*. Whatever the scientists may say, the religious mind, for which everything except God is God's creature, cannot help suggesting that the economy of the earth subserves man well because it was intended to do so. From this point of view, natural providence, for all its naturalness, is an expression of God's grace, of His benevolent interest in the human species. To call this view anthropocentric is merely to use an epithet, not to argue against it; and the epithet is the wrong one, for the view draws all its force from a prior theocentric view of everything. The interpretation of the material world by reference to God and man, though not coercive, could stand comfortably if there were not the problem of natural evil. This problem is lessened, but not removed, by recognizing that it arises out of the government of the natural world by general laws, and that these *are* good for man, because they provide him with a predictable and

therefore reliable environment; the alternative would be worse. The surd of the problem is whether a wholly good creator could not have fashioned a system that would work without such misfortunes as earthquakes and morbid germs. This query remains open, because it requires omniscience to answer it. It is enough for our present subject that the order of Nature is in general good for man; which means, for one who believes in God, that it is providential; and providence is grace.

Besides being useful to us, Nature is also beautiful in the large sense that includes, along with the quiet beauty of flower, bird, trees and meadow, the formidable grandeur of mountain masses, of an angry sea, or of a livid and lightning-riven sky. Now so far as we know, only man can apprehend beauty, or impute it. Such attempts as have been made to explain naturalistically either the fact of nature as beauty or our irrepressible supposition of it seem to me to be logically very weak. The only plausible explanation I know of it is the religious one: the Creator is an Artist. By adding beauty to use, God has doubled His grace to us in the material world. Those saints who spurned this beauty as nothing but a siren that calls us away from the love of the Creator to the love of the creature were either not taking the creature seriously enough, since this means seeing it as expressive of the Creator, or else were regarding God, as schoolboys do their examiner, as setting traps.

Is there within the material world, besides the grace of natural providence, any miraculous grace? If so, it would be particular in its immediate purpose—for a people, as for example the Israelites, or for a group, or for an individual. That the *possibility* of special incursions into the inanimate world of the Creator's continuing power cannot be excluded is a theological commonplace. Our contemporary hesitation about their *actuality* rests partly on our acceptance of an obsolescent science, partly on the fact that many of us have never knowingly seen a miraculous event within the purely material order, and partly on our awareness of the frailty of human testimony. It rests also on religious grounds, for instance on the desire to keep religion separate from its shadow and counterfeit, superstition, and on a reverence that shrinks from anything that would suggest variableness, triviality, or showmanship in God's ways of working. Not all these grounds of hesitation can be decently dismissed. To multiply the reports of miracles, or to swallow as many of them as we can, is not the most reverent way of glorifying God. Nor is the wholesale rejection of them a proof of intellectual enlightenment or integrity. Once the possibility of miraculous intervention has been accepted, the problem becomes one not of miracles as a class, but of particular miracles, each to be examined in the light of the peculiar evidence for and against it. There have been, and still are, some very strange happenings. Not all of them bear the marks of divine grace, unless we queerly take mere strangeness as such a mark. But some of them do, and so far as they do let us admit them and be grateful.

### III. HUMAN LIFE

That God showed His goodness to individuals before the coming and exaltation of Christ, and that He shows it still outside the Church, are sound theological deductions, if we hold that the Incarnation, besides being a special fact



with special consequences, is a symbol or revelation of God's constant concern for man. We are therefore obliged to take seriously the accounts from all times and places of God's visitations to sensitive souls, and to suppose that many more such visitations have gone unrecorded.

To get order and brevity within this article, however, we must put the subject on a general plane. What, outside the Christian dispensation, has God done (and is still doing) for the human race within its mental (meaning by this all its non-bodily) constitution? Much, obviously, by His natural providence in making us with a variety of capacities, the realization of which is both useful and enjoyable, and useful and enjoyable at a variety of levels. The point at issue seems to be whether by these natural capacities or faculties alone we can explain the general course of human history, and in particular man's higher cultural attainments. May we postulate here an activity of divine benevolence other than that expressed in the nature we have by creation, and than that mediated by the historical and risen Christ?

The question compels me to entrench on the province of another article in this series. To avoid it would be to leave a yawning gap in my line of argument. That province is the philosophy of history. About this we hear nowadays little from philosophers and much from theologians. The latter, having *ex professo* a selective point of view and a dogmatic index, can declare that history is in intention 'salvation history'—which is patently the Biblical doctrine. As for the philosophers, there are still many (chiefly outside England) who have not lost faith in the right and power to speculate beyond experience; yet they have become shy of deducing a clue to history, and are aware that they cannot induce one, because the mass of known historical fact has become unmanageable. It is possible, however, to follow an intermediate line by taking the human story in its broadest development. For there plainly has been a broad development, and a very astonishing one. We may, indeed, amuse ourselves with the question whether we are better than our grandfathers, or than the Romans or the Greeks, and confuse as well as amuse ourselves if we do not state our criteria; but it is not decently deniable that there is an enormous gulf between the cave-man and the modern man, and that that gulf is to be defined by saying that the modern man is vastly more developed, in the twofold sense that he has realized more capacities and more of each capacity. The term 'modern man' is here used to cover, not all who happen to live in the modern age, but those who have absorbed, however imperfectly, the accumulated and distilled experience of the whole past of the race.

Our question can now be put in a more definite form. Can that stupendous development be explained entirely by natural factors—by the use of our given faculties, along with social sharing and transmission through oral tradition, writing, and institutions? If it can, God is still behind it, but as ultimate cause only, acting with purely natural providence. If it cannot, we must suppose that God has continued to be active in His human creatures, directing the process without suspending its natural laws. A relevant, though imperfect, analogy would be a builder who turns stones into a church by the very use of their natural properties, and who, by nothing but a change of purpose, could turn them into a bull-ring. Of course, stones, unlike human beings, cannot rebel against or escape from the builder's direction, but this imperfection of the

analogy would explain how a divinely directed history could show flaws.

The question cannot be answered demonstrably. One reason is our ignorance: we simply do not know what belongs *essentially* to the human mind, and therefore cannot prove that one given achievement is wholly natural and another one partly so. I myself suspect that the reason lies deeper, not in our ignorance of mind, but in mind itself. One thing is clear, that mind is so different from matter that our attempts at understanding it in the ways that are successful with matter land us in difficulties. The present state of psychology, judged as a natural science, is certainly scandalous. When we study the mind methodically, the scientific ground soon gives way and drops us into the abyss of metaphysics. Do but scratch it, and you are through its phenomenal and scientifically verifiable skin. Of course it has a nature, but a very odd one. Of course it is natural, for the finite mind begins in time, is attached to and affected by material conditions, and exhibits many uniformities in its processes; but it has a way of bursting these bounds to work and play in fields of its own. In short, we may say either that if the human mind is wholly natural, the system of Nature is profoundly different from what the scientists take it to be, or else that in the human mind the distinction between the natural and the supernatural can become very thin.

The course of the race covers a great deal of squalor. Some of this is plainly due to regression, some to laziness, some to ignorance, and some to what only man is capable of, namely, wickedness—*corruptio optimi pessima*. It covers also a great deal of splendour. What is this due to? Pressure from below? This is bad as description, and as theory it is very dogmatic. To a capacity for illusion and delusion? This is neither description nor theory, but cynicism. Consider the types of splendour, of which it is sufficient to mention religion, morality, art and science. The first is not in fact a mere insurance, or a way of escaping from instinctive fears, nor is the second in fact merely a refined form of prudence, or only a social convenience. That art is the sublimation of the sex-instinct is not profound but silly; this theory does not explain even a Venus de Milo, not to mention a still life by Chardin, or a mediaeval illuminated manuscript, or an orchestral symphony, nor does it give any ground for setting Shelley above Ella Wheeler Wilcox. As for science, to say that its natural root is curiosity is to leave out all that distinguishes it from panting after trifles. Of course, we could posit a special instinct for each of these four types of achievement; but that would be no more than saying that since we do in fact act in these ways, we must have the corresponding capacities—a truism, not a step forward in explanation, not a proof that all the conditions of these achievements are within our natural make-up. Such ways of explaining our development seem to me not only unhelpful now, but also unpromising. The present state and trend of the sciences is nowhere near to displaying the long journey from the cave-man to the modern man as nothing but a series of natural steps—as the inevitable unfolding of what was originally implicit, or as a set of happenings that, given time enough, could arise by statistical probability. The paradox here is that science cannot explain itself.

The origin and development of our higher culture remain mysteries in a naturalistic philosophy, the very kind of philosophy that cannot bear mysteries. They become intelligible when brought into connexion with the idea of a

gracious God who continues to work on and in His human creatures for their betterment. Those Alexandrian Fathers were surely right who felt that the culture of Greece just had to be referred to God; and those contemporary theologians who disparage whatever is not religion, even whatever is not Christian, while they may find Biblical texts to ground a doctrine of the work of the Spirit in the natural world, cannot fill out the doctrine with the rich facts that exemplify it, and cannot give the becoming response to this impressive and thrilling aspect of God's grace.

T. E. JESSOP

---

## THE WORK OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN HISTORY

**T**HE SUBJECT of the Holy Spirit in human history is by no means an easy one to discuss. How is the Christian to discern the operation of the Spirit of God in the whole sweep of human history, 'secular' as well as 'ecclesiastical'? Can he, indeed, expect to be able in any way at all to discern such a moving of the divine Spirit in the complex tangle of events? Does the Christian doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity encourage him to do so? Even if the answer to this last question should be 'Yes', the Christian has to remember that such an activity of the Holy Spirit is not a plain fact observable to the secular as well as the Christian historian. No amount of scientific historical study, however zealously and sincerely it may be pursued, will of itself reveal the working of the mind and power of the Spirit of God. The Spirit is not an object discernible by the historian in his professional capacity. If the Christian, nevertheless, discerns the Holy Spirit at work in the historical process, it must be by the eye of faith; history itself will not supply the means by which the work of the Spirit is perceived. What considerations, then, may perhaps lead him to affirm that the field of history is in fact the scene of the operation of the Holy Ghost, and how can he justify those considerations to the secular historian whose sphere of investigation affords no grounds for such a belief? How is he to relate such modes of the Spirit's working as he may think he has discerned to what he knows of the operation of the Spirit in the Scriptures, the Church, and the individual soul?

In some ways, it is easier to say how the Christian must refuse to conceive of the work of the Spirit in general history than to give any positive answer to these questions. The Spirit of God is not to be thought of as an impersonal force, a principle of development immanent in the historical process. The Holy Spirit is a person; He is not a power or influence, or a mysterious force like an electric current. He is God—the personal Living God who is revealed to men in Jesus Christ, and who approaches men and deals with them as a Person with persons. It is perhaps significant that the early Church took a long time, the best part of three hundred years, to make quite clear to itself its conviction, based on Christian experience and the working out of the implications of the biblical revelation, that the Holy Spirit is indeed God, of the same essence with the Father and the Son. Certainly, this is a truth which, as the history of Christian faith and practice too often and too plainly shows, the Church is constantly in danger of forgetting, with the most serious consequences for sound theology and devotional integrity. The root of most superstitions is to be found in an inadequate conception of the personality of the Holy Ghost; and the theology of grace, the Church and the Sacraments is constantly being vitiated by false notions of the Spirit as a thing, an 'it', an impersonal or mechanical force which is inevitably thought of as being in some way capable of being controlled and manipulated by persons. Trinitarian doctrine, so the history of Christian belief would seem to suggest, reaches its point of greatest difficulty when it asserts the true nature of the Holy Spirit; for men find it peculiarly hard to grasp the doctrine that the Third Person is personal, an eternal mode of being of the one God—the Living God of the Scriptural revelation. Yet to fail to do this, and even more, to fail not merely to grasp the orthodox credal doctrine as a truth to be intellectually apprehended but also to make it an integral and vital element in Christian life and worship, is disastrous to theology and devotion alike.

We must start, then, from the full acceptance of the personality of the Holy Spirit as the Third Person of the Godhead. This is our basic presupposition; and as we can see so plainly how fatal have been the effects of a reduced and depersonalized conception of the Spirit over so many fields of Christian thought and practice, we shall not expect to arrive at any sound conclusions if we allow ourselves to fall into the fundamental error of thinking of the Spirit as either an impersonal and quasi-material force, or as being merely immanent. As God, the Holy Ghost cannot be merely an immanent principle in the world or in the cosmic process or in the complex development of human history.

We must not, therefore, confuse the Spirit of God with the principle of evolution, if we postulate such a principle. Nor is the Holy Spirit to be confused with, and mistaken for, the *zeitgeist*. He is not some immanent principle of progress inherent in the course of history, nor is He to be identified with the principle of the Hegelian dialectic or with the supposedly inevitable movement of the working out of the dialectic in its Marxist development.

So much may appear to be obvious; it may seem to be self-evident that Christians who believe in the divinity of the Holy Spirit cannot accept any theory which would reduce Him to a point where He might be identified with an immanent principle in an historical process. Yet in fact the temptation is strong to do this very thing, and many Christians who would profess their

acceptance of the full orthodox doctrine of the divinity of the Spirit find themselves almost unconsciously making this very identification. In the days when the notion of the inevitability of the 'march of progress' was more universally popular than it is today, much Christian thought fell into the error of believing that the operation of the Spirit was to be discerned precisely in this supposed evolutionary principle, immanent in the process of history, by which human affairs were being moved steadily towards the goal of perfection. This belief, reflected in so many nineteenth- and early twentieth-century hymns, was an idolatry which is in no small measure responsible for our modern frustrations and disillusionments.

It is fatally easy, too, to identify the Holy Spirit with the 'spirit' of a movement, whether within a nation or a class, or with whatever may conduce to the attainment of an ideal, whether this be peace, liberty, equality, or any other social or political goal. It is a powerful temptation to imagine that 'God is working His purpose out' in terms of some one particular political or economic programme of human action, so that to further the realization of that programme is to be a fellow-worker with God. The Holy Spirit may readily be confused in our minds with election-time enthusiasm.

Here idolatry reaches its climax. The Holy Spirit is not the spirit of human movements and organizations. He is not the driving force behind any move to achieve a political or social programme. The aims of such movements may be expressed in personal or ethical terms, such as liberty, equality, fraternity, but these terms remain essentially abstract and impersonal, while the Spirit of God is a Person and speaks to and deals with persons as He refashions them after the image of God. The Christian experience of the Holy Spirit ought therefore to be the world's chief safeguard—indeed, its only ultimate safeguard—against the Utopianism which is the deadly enemy not only of Christianity but of all moral values. If once we begin to attribute to 'the march of progress', to the process of the Marxist dialectic or to any human movement the values which belong only to the operation of the Spirit of God, if we set up the objects of political or economic action in the place which belongs to the divine, then we shall inevitably seek to find in the working out of these movements or in the attainment of these objects our *summum bonum*, and to achieve the *summum bonum* is generally thought to justify the employment of any means. The twentieth century has witnessed the infliction of untold misery upon their fellow human beings by men who sincerely believe that Utopia is just round the corner, that the inevitable progress of history itself must bring us there, and that to speed up the process, to co-operate with the forward march of the spirit of man, is worth the liquidation of a social class, the launching of atomic war, or the 'social engineering' whose tools are the concentration camp and the gas chamber.

Against the grave tendency of our time to deify the spirit of the nation, the group, or the class, and to endow human Utopias with the attributes that belong only to the Kingdom of God, the Christian will remember that the Holy Spirit is not an abstraction, but a Person, and that it is in precisely that sphere of personal values and relationships which humanist Utopianism ignores or destroys that His operation is most plainly and characteristically to be discerned. So for the Christian there can be no confusion between the real and living Spirit



of God and the mythical abstractions, the 'movements', 'forces', and 'principles' to which secularism so often ascribes the development of human history.

What, then, are we to say more positively about the operation of the Holy Spirit in the field of history? We shall, of course, if we are believers in the Trinity, conceive of the Holy Ghost as operative in the whole course of God's sustaining and guiding Providence from the beginning of creation. The picture given to us in the opening verses of Genesis where the Spirit of God broods upon the face of the waters of chaos reminds us of the continuous work of the Spirit in bringing life and order into being and maintaining the divine creation against dissolution. Nevertheless, we do not associate God's providential government of His world primarily with the Third Person. Rather do we see the action of the Holy Spirit in the revelation of that Providence to man. That the course of history is providentially directed, that history is the sphere of God's guidance and of divine judgement, that it is the scene of God's continual overruling of man's sinfulness so that the divine purposes are set forward even when man has deliberately disobeyed the divine commandments—all this is by no means obvious to the student of history as such. That the historian in the actual exercise of his own pursuit should profess himself unable to discern pattern or significance in the apparent disorder of events need occasion no surprise to the Christian. The student of history, within the limits set by his own discipline, can perhaps scarcely do otherwise. Belief in divine Providence follows from belief in God; it is a matter of faith, and faith is not to be attained by demonstration from the facts of history themselves.

The Old Testament indicates that it is the function of prophetic inspiration to convince men, not merely in a vague and general fashion that the course of history is providentially ordered by God's government, but that the events of history are the medium through which God reveals Himself to mankind. Prophetic inspiration, described as it is in various ways in the pages of the Old Testament, is rightly regarded as one of the most important and striking modes of the operation of the Spirit of God. The prophets, through the inspiration of the Spirit and the illumination of their minds and consciences by that inspiration, were enabled to discern God's word of revelation in historical events and to grasp their character as crises—moments of God's judgement and of His saving grace. They were enabled also to look back upon the ancient traditions of the Hebrew race and to see the whole sweep of Israelite history as the sphere of the revelation of the living God, the sphere in which God was revealing Himself as 'I will be that I will be'. We may say, if we will, that it is by the action of the Holy Spirit that history becomes 'sacred history'. The secular historian who keeps within the bounds of his professional field could find none of this significance, indeed very little of interest or importance, in the history of ancient Israel. It is only when the events recorded in the historical books of the Old Testament are seen in the light of the insight given by the divine Spirit that those books can be written, not as the history which belongs to the professional historian's regular field of study, but in such a way that they can later be described as 'the former prophets'. It is in the light of the Spirit's revelation—that is, through the quickening by the Spirit of the prophetic mind and conscience—that the events become God's medium of His self-revelation to His people. In the Old Testament writings, the Spirit

has taken the things of God and shown them to men through the series of historical events.

We must not forget, however, that a basic element in the Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit is the truth expressed in the statement in the Fourth Gospel that 'Spirit was not yet, for Jesus was not yet glorified'. The peculiar 'economy' of the Spirit, the work which is pre-eminently and in a special sense the function of the Third Person, is to take of the things of Christ and reveal them to men. The Holy Spirit mediates Christ to the believer and to the community of believers; He brings the individual and the Church continually to Christ. His work flows out of the accomplishment of the salvation of man by Christ. It is when Christ has died, risen, and ascended to the right hand of God that the Pentecostal descent of the Holy Spirit comes upon His disciples. In the corresponding Johannine picture, it is the risen Christ, and perhaps we are to understand also the ascended Christ, who breathes upon His followers and imparts to them the Spirit that is His own. In the Christian dispensation the Spirit of God is revealed as being the Spirit of Jesus Christ. In a true and profound sense, though not of course as a literal ontological fact, the Spirit 'was not' before the glorification of Christ.

This does not mean that the Holy Spirit had not been active in the dispensation of the Old Covenant, preparing the way for Christ's coming through His work of opening men's eyes to the significance of history, and teaching them to see in the events of history both the judgements of God and the earnest of the ultimate fulfilment of His promises. Under the guidance of the divine Spirit, notwithstanding the fact that the nature of the Person and work of the Spirit were not fully understood within the limitations of the pre-Christian order, the creative and redemptive purposes of God were discerned in what was seen to be the pattern of Israel's history, and so were discerned also on the still wider scale which was demanded by men's increasing grasp of the truth of the One God, in the whole history of the world from the first emergence of order out of chaos. God was seen at work in judgement and mercy, above all as the covenant God of His chosen people. His will to choose a people for His own possession and to vindicate and redeem them was perceived through the 'mighty works' of the deliverance from Egypt and the successive events of Israel's history. To the mind of Jeremiah, the disaster of the Babylonian conquest manifested the character of God and was a necessary part of the pattern of His dealings with the people of His choice. History was interpreted in the light of a fundamental principle; for the complex tangle of events was viewed in relation to the central thought of the covenant between God and man, and divine election was seen as the key to the understanding of history. So, through the guidance and illumination of the Spirit of God, there was prepared the setting and framework of the decisive act of God in Christ; for it was in the context of history viewed in this way as 'sacred history', that Christ interpreted the meaning of His mission, and His followers understood it.

In the wider sphere of extra-biblical history also, the Holy Spirit guides men to discern the providential ordering of events under the hand of God. This is particularly true, as the early Church saw so plainly, of the *praeparatio evangelica* in the Greco-Roman world before and at the time of the coming of Christ. The action of the Spirit may be discerned, not only in His inter-

preting to Christian believers the things of Christ, and enabling them to see that the Incarnation took place in a providentially ordered setting (in the fullness of time); it may also be discerned in the development in mankind, outside the Hebraic covenant, of aspirations, needs and hopes which only Christ could satisfy. In this sense, just as Justin saw the activity of the Logos in the religious and philosophical developments of the Gentile world, so we may find there a secondary action of the Holy Spirit in a work of preparation. If this is so, then we may reasonably see the same preparatory work in process in our own day, in the kindling of hopes and expectations, and in processes of disillusionment as well, by which the path of the Gospel is made ready.

Yet the chief and peculiar work of the Spirit is always the presentation of Christ to men and of men to Christ. His function is not merely to deliver us from mechanistic and deterministic conceptions of history; it is pre-eminently to build up the Body of Christ. Here is the true work of the Spirit in history—the furtherance of the Gospel, as in the days of the Acts of the Apostles, by word and deed, and the consequent building of the Spirit-filled community of Christ's people of the New Covenant. The Church is the one group which does possess a collective spirit in something more than an artificial or abstract sense; it is the one society where the corporate spirit does not conflict with, or interfere with, the personality of the individual members of the group; for its Spirit is the personal Spirit of Christ informing both the society collectively and the individuals who compose it. It is the work of the Spirit within the Body to complete the task of creation after the image of God, and to raise human personality to its full stature in Christ.

For the secular historian, the Church, humanly considered, can be only one among the varied phenomena of social history. For the Christian, it will be seen in relation to the divine purpose as the sphere of the Holy Spirit's operation in history. In the light of the Christian understanding of the Spirit, the building of the Church is the supreme object of God's providence, and the clue to history's pattern and significance.

G. W. H. LAMPE

---

## THE MARIAN MARTYRS

AMONG THE many books and tracts which John Wesley issued for the instruction of his Methodists was an edition of Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*. The book was severely abridged. Large parts were unnecessary for the common reader; other parts Wesley did not think much of. He himself said he had—'purged away all that trash which that honest injudicious writer has heaped together, and mingled with those venerable records which are worthy to be held in everlasting remembrance.' The heart of the book is the English martyrs, and particularly the Marian martyrs. This is a story that we should not willingly let die. And since this year 1955 marks the fourth centenary of the beginning of the burnings in Mary's reign, it may not be amiss to remind ourselves of this notable and glorious history.

But it may be that some readers are beginning to feel uneasy. The story depends mainly, though not entirely, upon Foxe, but what are we to say of Foxe? Wesley considered Foxe to be injudicious, perhaps, but at least honest. Can we say as much today? Was there not in the nineteenth century a vigorous and sustained attack on Foxe's accuracy and honesty, which so far undermined his credit that sober scholars looked askance at him, and popular writers unsympathetic to the Reformation have freely branded him as utterly untrustworthy, an unmitigated liar and the like?

Certainly there was such a campaign, but this adverse verdict no longer holds the field. Modern opinion is far more favourable to Foxe. I myself have had the honour of examining the whole question in *John Foxe and His Book* (1940), and my main conclusions have been widely accepted. To quote a very recent opinion—C. S. Lewis in his *English Literature in the Sixteenth Century* (1953) considers that I have 'defended Foxe's integrity with complete success' and that Foxe 'emerges not as a great historian but as an honest man'. Foxe, of course, draws most of his stories from the martyrs and their friends, but even the victims of a persecution may speak the truth. Their stories bear an unmistakable stamp of sincerity, and in their main features they support one another.

The Marian burnings were the final and conclusive proof that the English Reformation was come to stay. The new movement now stood the extreme test, and confounded the scoffers and doubters. When men first began to rebel against the mediaeval Church and to demand reform, their task seemed almost impossible. The enormous power and prestige of the papacy, backed as it was by the secular rulers, was calculated to strike fear into the stoutest heart. Men had been taught from infancy that there was no salvation outside the Church, that it was their duty to obey the pope and his ministers, who stood in Christ's stead. If a man rebelled, to whom was he to join himself save to a few scattered persons as weak as himself? If a man died at the stake, he must face the unknown alone and without the backing of the great army of his fellows. Might he not be wrong? And if not wrong, still to follow the Church when she was wrong was nevertheless (so he was taught) to enter into salvation: for it was her province to decide these matters and not his; *she* would be answerable for his error, if error it was. Under such doubts and fears most of the Lollards conformed in the end. Even the martyrs had already recanted once.

When the Reformation began, things were more favourable. The reform was

on a wider front and backed by a broader learning: for humanism had appeared and the knowledge of Greek and Hebrew was revived. Printing had come, and the rebel was more in touch with his sympathizers. Yet even now the old spirit of instinctive subservience remained strong. 'In all king Henry's [VIII] reign', writes Foxe, 'how few were they that burned which did not recant before.' There were indeed grand exceptions, pointing a better way. Tyndale never wavered, nor did Frith. But the Protestant movement was not yet so strong nor so sure of itself as to convince the world that it could stand against the combined powers of Church and monarchy.

The Marian burnings provided the answer. The English Protestants had found a coherent theology and a noble liturgy. They knew their Bible and interpreted its doctrine by means of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the homilies and the Forty-two Articles. They had been well and truly taught by the Edwardian divines, and when the martyrs went to the fire they proved for all the world to see the strength and sincerity of their faith.

In the popular view the blame for the persecution rests upon Queen Mary. 'Bloody Mary' she has been called, and though the epithet may be too harsh (for she was a kindly woman in private matters), the popular verdict is not without justification. Attempts have been made to shift the blame on to the shoulders of Gardiner or Pole, but each of these was in power for only a part of the reign, and though they aided her it is clear that the Queen made the running.

She came to the throne with a determination to restore the pope and to repress heresy. For this she had been raised up by God, and her preachers assured her that she was a second Virgin Mary called to purge a realm that had fallen under the dominion of Satan. Everybody could see her pious zeal and whither her desires tended, and the Emperor Charles the Fifth and his ambassadors, more worldly wise than she, had much ado to persuade her not to risk her throne, which was still very insecure, by any drastic action in the repression of heresy, but to wait till she could get the support of parliament. But her parliaments proved unexpectedly stubborn, and it was not until the closing weeks of 1554 that the requisite legislation could be extracted from it. The pope was restored, the old heresy laws were revived, and it became once again possible (on 20th January 1555) to burn a Protestant.

Without delay the persecution began. A special commission of the Privy Council, with Gardiner the Lord Chancellor as President, was appointed, and a group of notable divines who had been languishing in prison for many months until the law could be changed was brought to trial. The first of these, John Rogers, the editor of the Matthew Bible of 1537, was burnt at Smithfield on 4th February 1555, and for nearly four years the martyrdoms flowed on in a steady stream, save that there was some slackening in the final months of the reign, as the Queen's last fatal sickness came upon her. The Queen and Privy Council gave a lead throughout, egging on slothful bishops (even Bonner was rebuked for slackness), scolding lenient sheriffs, appointing commissions to hunt down heretics. That the Queen was no mere tool of her Council in the matter is shown by the martyrdom of Bembridge at Winchester early in August 1558. When Bembridge came to the stake and felt the first touch of the fire, he cried out, 'I recant.' The Sheriff of Hampshire stopped the proceedings and took the man back to prison, but soon found himself in trouble. The



Queen pronounced his action 'very strange', and he was instructed to burn the man 'out of hand', and was himself summoned to London and thrown into the Fleet for his merciful dealing. Here we see the Queen, sick and overwhelmed in misery, disillusioned, disappointed, abandoned by her husband, alienated from her people, yet intervening personally to send to the slaughter one more unhappy victim whom there was every excuse for sparing, had an excuse been desired. Doubtless she had (like many others) underrated the stoutness of the Protestants, and thought they would easily be reduced, but when she proved wrong, she did not falter, but continued in her fatal course to the bitter end.

But the attempt has been made to shift part of the blame on to the shoulders of the martyrs. The persecution, we are told by Mary's champions, was unavoidable—firstly, because the Protestants had dabbled in treason or rebellion, and, secondly, because they used such violent language against Mary's religion that she had no choice but to retaliate with repression. As to treason, it is true that Cranmer and Ridley and a handful more had supported Northumberland's attempt to make Lady Jane Grey queen, but Protestant opinion in general supported Mary; and in any case Cranmer and Ridley, like the rest of the supporters of Jane, save a few ringleaders, were pardoned for their political offences, and were burnt as heretics, not as traitors. The charge of violent language is equally applicable to Mary and her party. Each side was intolerant of the other's theology. If the Protestants used strong language, they received equally strong language from the very opening of the reign, and not only strong language, but strong actions. Their leaders were cast into prison and languished there untried; they saw their Prayer Book services taken from them with the Queen's tacit approval, long before it became legal (on 20th December 1553) to do this; and their ministers were browbeaten by bishops and justices.

To complain of hard words in the divines of the sixteenth century does not carry us far; it is more useful to consider the doctrines of the martyrs. We are sometimes told they were wild and vain men, each interpreting the Bible after his own fancy, with no coherent theology. On the contrary, they brought into English religion things that had been too long absent, things whose recovery was absolutely necessary, things which, now that they have been recovered, we must never let die.

Broadly speaking, the martyrs stood by the Edwardian formularies. They clung fiercely to the Bible; they read it and knew it as a rule better than their examiners. Justification by faith, two sacraments as requisite, the freedom of the clergy to marry, the priesthood of the laity, the Pope as one bishop among many and not as head of the Church, external ceremonies as secondary things and not as primary—such were the doctrines they held. The Edwardian divines had done their work well and instructed their followers to some purpose. Even such martyrs as could not read usually made a good showing before their judges. There were some minor variations among them, and we may feel they sometimes pushed their principles too far and too stringently, but in the main their position was solid and sober enough. It is quite a mistake to suppose that they were irresponsible men, each following his own fancy of what could be proved from the Bible, each puffed up with the idea that he was competent to give a

judgement on matters too deep for him. There was a real coherence in their teaching. If most of them were unlearned men, they had sense enough to follow the learning of better divines than themselves, and in interpreting the Bible followed not their own fantasies, but the interpretation of the Prayer Book and the Edwardian formularies. And if ever they go beyond these formularies or fall into a blunder, we have to ask ourselves whether what they said was what they really meant. Few were men of university standard, some could not read, all were prisoners cut off from books and from the helps that were available to free men; and they were confronted by the panoply and majesty of the law, facing judges who had every advantage on their side and had been specially trained for the purpose. All things considered, it is surprising how good a case they made, how well they came out of the ordeal. The historian R. W. Dixon, a strong High Churchman, gives it as his opinion that the martyrs were the fathers of the modern Church of England.

In the early months of the reign several notable divines had been arrested and put in prison, there to wait for the time when the laws against heresy should be revived. This was quite illegal. In some cases no offence whatever had been committed, for to preach Protestantism was perfectly legal in the early months of the reign. In other cases there was an offence, but a small one (for example, that of preaching after the Queen had forbidden preaching by the proclamation of 18th August); but they should have been tried and tried speedily for this offence, and not kept in confinement indefinitely.

The chief prisoners were Hooper, bishop of Gloucester, Ferrar, bishop of St David's, Barlow, bishop of Bath, Bradford and Rogers, prebendaries of Paul's, Rowland Taylor, parson of Hadleigh in Suffolk, Laurence Saunders and John Cardmaker, incumbents of city churches. These were all held in London, but in Oxford there were Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer; for the Government had conceived the idea of preparing for the persecution by a spectacular demonstration of the superiority of the 'catholic' theology to that of the reformers, and had transported these three bishops to Oxford, there to hold a public disputation in the schools with divines selected from both universities. This was in April 1554; each bishop appeared by himself. The reformers were pronounced to have been vanquished and were kept in confinement at Oxford waiting for the time when they could be condemned and sent to the stake.

The divines in London appeared one by one before Gardiner's commission on 22nd January 1555. Bishop Barlow recanted; John Cardmaker appeared to waver for a moment, but if he did (he denied it himself), recovered and went boldly to the fire. The rest stood stoutly to their guns and defended their position with ample learning and ability. But their case was hopeless, for they boldly avowed their convictions, and these were now illegal. One of them, indeed, Laurence Saunders, offered to live quietly in the realm without preaching, provided only that he need not go to mass. 'You are not meet to live,' retorted Gardiner, and so they were all condemned. Bishop Ferrar was sent to be tried and executed in his cathedral city of St David's. The rest, after being condemned by Gardiner, were sent to be burnt in their home cities—Hooper in Gloucester, Saunders in Coventry, Taylor in Hadleigh, and the others in London. This was the usual practice throughout the persecution,

to burn the martyrs in their own district, that their neighbours might take warning thereby.

The first to suffer was John Rogers—at Smithfield on 4th February 1555. The French ambassador witnessed the execution and wrote home to his sovereign that the scene was like a wedding. The greater part of the people uttered cries of joy and encouragement to the martyr. In the vast multitude stood his wife and eleven children. With a singular brutality, both Gardiner and Bonner had forbidden her to pay her husband a farewell visit in prison (she was a whore and not a wife) and now she stood by the wayside with her eleven children to strengthen him for the ordeal. He died quietly and even joyfully, as though he felt no pain. As he stood at the stake his pardon was brought from the Queen, but this he utterly refused; and so did his fellow-martyrs elsewhere. 'If you love my soul, away with it,' cried Hooper when he saw the paper at Gloucester. 'Not for all Salisbury,' cried John Maundrel when he suffered at Salisbury on 24th March 1556. This continual rejection of the Queen's mercy displeased the council, and after a few months they ordered that no more pardons were to be offered.

This brilliant beginning of the divines set the note for the whole persecution. Heartened by their splendid examples, a long line of men and women went to the fire and proved not unworthy of their leaders. In all about two hundred and ninety suffered, of whom some fifty were women. One infant was burnt unborn with his mother, Elizabeth Pepper, another—in Guernsey in 1556—was born when his mother felt the heat of the flame, and though he was alive and 'a fair man child', was cast into the flames by order of the officer. More than twenty were of the clergy, a dozen or so are described as gentlemen, and the rest were artisans or workmen of various kinds. More than forty trades are represented in the list—weavers, bakers, tallow-chandlers, etc. The Jesuit, Robert Parsons, who in 1603-4 made a strong attack on Foxe and his martyrs, scoffs repeatedly at the humble station of these poor victims. These cobblers, tallow-chandlers and the like, 'how contemptible and piteous a rabblement' compared with the divines, kings, and nobles who figure in the old Church calendar. But he scoffs at what is a glory and not a shame. He had forgotten his New Testament, where 'not many mighty, not many noble' were called, and where Peter, James and John were fishermen.

The two hundred and ninety victims were not spread equally over the country. Most of them belonged to the dioceses of London, Norwich, Ely, Canterbury, Rochester and Chichester. These eastern and south-eastern districts not only contained the seat of government, but were generally more enterprising and ready for new doctrines than the sparsely populated and conservative counties of the north and west. It may also be that in some dioceses the bishop or his commissary was merciful and ready to wink, so that some victims escaped who would otherwise have gone to the fire. Thus Tostall, bishop of Durham, instructed his Chancellor to spare one who was in danger of the fire. 'Hitherto,' he said, 'we have had a good report among our neighbours. I pray thee bring not this poor man's blood upon my head.'

As the diocese of London contained the counties of Middlesex, Essex, and Herts, as well as the capital city, its bishop, Bonner, figures more largely in the trials and condemnations than any other bishop, especially since the Privy

Council would occasionally hand over to him a prisoner (e.g. John Philpot) who did not properly belong to his jurisdiction. This activity and prominence in the persecution earned for him the execration of the Protestants; so much so that when he died some ten years after Elizabeth's accession it was considered advisable to have him buried secretly by night for fear of a tumult. It is true that the persecution was pressed upon him by the Crown and that he was close under the eye of the Council, and his modern defenders remind us that now and then he showed a rough kindness to a prisoner. He himself resented the title 'Bloody Bonner' that was popularly used of him, and often sought to rebut it in examining prisoners. Still, the fact remains that he did lend his hand to this work; and the contempt and indignation which he, like Gardiner (both men were legists), felt for men of private and humble station, and sometimes of scant learning, who had the hardiness to set themselves against the laws of both Church and State, of both queen and pope—this, together with his natural hastiness of temper, led him to frequent outbursts of rage. 'Though thou and all the sort of you would see me hanged', he said to Roger Holland, 'yet I shall live to burn—yea, I will burn all the sort of you that come into my hands.' Several times too he falls upon his prisoners and beats them with his own hands, plucks out their beards and the like.

Some of the martyrs suffered alone; others had one or more companions to share their misery and to give them courage. The largest number to be burnt in the same fire was thirteen at Stratford in Essex on 27th June 1556; but twelve suffered on the same day at Colchester on 2nd August 1557, six in the forenoon and six in the afternoon. At Canterbury seven were burnt together on 19th June 1557 and six at Brentford on 14th July 1558. Some of the larger towns witnessed more than one burning. At Smithfield forty-five suffered in all, at Canterbury thirty-eight, at Colchester twenty-three, at Stratford fifteen, at Bury St Edmunds eleven, at Norwich eight, at Maidstone seven.

The examinations were often short and summary, but sometimes dragged out to inordinate length, as in the case of Philpot, and of Woodman, an iron-maker of Sussex. Five or six hearings were not uncommon, and twelve or fourteen examinations were not unknown. These delays might be due to the martyr's skill and readiness in availing himself of every point in his favour (e.g. by denying the bishop's jurisdiction), or to his having influential friends, who begged the bishop to give him every chance, or to the general faith in logic which made both parties believe that sooner or later the other side must be convinced, or even perhaps to a certain forbearance in the judges, engendered by the consciousness that they had themselves, as the prisoners were not slow to point out, been preaching not long ago the very doctrines for which they were preparing to condemn their victim.

The martyrs, of course, were not the only persons who refused to bow the knee in Mary's reign. Others there were who escaped from the attentions of justices, constables and informers. We would gladly know more of the means by which they escaped. Neighbours might be tolerant; influential friends might help you. In most cases it would be necessary to move from place to place when danger threatened. Lady Vane found refuge for several months in the house of Thomas Thackham, who himself conformed. Archbishop Parker received a life-long injury to his leg in fleeing on horseback before his

enemies. It was particularly important to be absent from your parish when Easter came; for every man and woman was expected to be shriven and to communicate at that season. Edward Underhill, one of Queen Mary's guard, who had supported her against Northumberland, relates how, finding himself in danger at Limehouse, he moved to the city of London, and when danger again threatened, migrated to a wood near Coventry where he dwelt unmolested to the end of the reign without bowing the knee. A good many victims died in prison, whether before or after condemnation, and thus forestalled the martyrdom of blood. But several others who had been condemned as heretics in the latter months of the reign were not executed, since there was an expectation that the Queen might die.

At the executions the faggots were often carelessly laid or consisted of green wood, and the flames burnt so slowly that the martyr suffered intense agony. Ridley cried out, 'Let the fire come unto me. I cannot burn'; and Hooper was burning for forty-five minutes before he died. To lessen the pain, bags of gunpowder were in one or two cases (e.g. Ridley's) tied to the body by the martyr's friends, but not always so skilfully disposed as to effect the object intended. In general, however, the martyrs bore their agonies with a singular fortitude, showing few signs of pain and uttering no cries save prayers to God or to Christ. Latimer and a few of the old men died quickly from shock, with little or no pain.

The burnings were witnessed by great crowds, many of whom had come to support and encourage the victim, and though others would be unsympathetic and regard the day's work as an interesting spectacle, there was seldom any outburst or demonstration against the sufferer. These gatherings of sympathizers were a source of much uneasiness to the Privy Council and sheriffs; and orders were frequently given that no martyr must speak to the people, and that bystanders who shook his hand or shouted encouraging words should be arrested and punished. But the crowd's fervour was often too great to control, and the cries and tears of their fellow-believers must have been a great help to the martyrs in their dreadful ordeal.

These scenes were cruel enough, but the organizers had not reached that depth of inhumanity of which we hear in Russia today, where everything is done behind closed doors; the prisoner is examined in solitude and often throughout the night, is condemned in solitude, is killed in solitude and thus passes through his final agonies utterly cut off from all his fellow-men, save the few ruthless enemies who have his fate in their keeping.

The Marian burnings, however, were a great act of witness before the world. The martyrs might be forbidden to speak to the people, but their courage, devotion and faith were an inspiration to the thousands that flocked to the scene. Some learnt from the spectacle how to die when their own turn came for martyrdom, and many more learnt to revere the reformed doctrines for which these men died.

JAMES F. MOZLEY

---



## JOHN CENNICK: 12TH DECEMBER 1718—4TH JULY 1755<sup>1</sup>

ON 4th July 1755—two hundred years ago this month—John Cennick, worn out by toil, persecution, privation, and zeal, came home to die amongst his Moravian friends in Fetter Lane, London. It is therefore timely and fitting that his great story be again retold.

READING (DECEMBER 1718—JUNE 1739)

John Cennick came from good stock. His grandparents had emigrated from Germany during the religious persecutions, and had become members of the Baptist Church in Reading. They were soon imprisoned for their religious beliefs, and their wealth confiscated. His grandmother gathered pence by knitting socks. His parents attended St Lawrence Church, and from their earliest days the children endured a rigorous discipline.

John was born on 12th December 1718, and was the youngest, and only boy, of their seven children. Along with his sisters he was taken to Daily Prayers at St Lawrence Church, and on Sundays he spent the hours 'reading and saying hymns all day long with my sisters'. It was not surprising that in his early teens he rebelled and ran wild. His tastes, habits, and companions were decidedly worldly, and remained so for the following four years. 'I had forgotten Jesus.'

When sixteen years of age he entered upon what proved to be a prolonged and circuitous conversion. 'As I was walking hastily in Cheapside, in London, the hand of the Lord touched me.' For more than two years, mental depression and soul despair continued. Life was wearisome, and death was prayed for. In his desperation he adopted a severely ascetic life. But suddenly the sun shone. On Sunday, 6th September 1737, the Psalm for the Day (No. 34) had just ended when 'I was overwhelmed with joy and I believed there was mercy. . . . I rejoiced in God my Saviour.' He could now go about his work—he was a land-surveyor—in a new world, and life was altogether worth living. Someone lent him George Whitefield's *Journal*, which greatly impressed him, and he prayed that he might meet the author. His prayer was heard, but he had to wait eighteen months for the interview.

In May 1739, hearing that Whitefield was in London, Cennick 'set out from Reading, in the dusk of the evening, and walked all night'. He arrived at 8 a.m. the next morning. Whitefield was greatly impressed with the young fellow, and told him that Wesley purposed to build a School at Kingswood, Bristol, for colliers' children. Would he be willing to become a master there? Naturally, Cennick wanted to see the place and, returning home to Reading, set off for Bristol. Near the site a crowd was awaiting the arrival of a young preacher. He was late, so Cennick was pressed to fill the gap. With considerable trepidation, and brief but very earnest prayer, he stepped forward. The die was cast. His prayer was heard. His vocation assured. John Cennick

became John Wesley's first lay preacher, and also had some oversight of the school at Kingswood.

#### BRISTOL (JUNE 1739-JUNE 1741)

For the next eighteen months Cennick was in full charge of the New Room in Bristol. This did not exhaust his energies but rather whetted his enthusiasm. In July 1740 the 'Awakening of Wiltshire' began and continued until December 1745.

Meanwhile, Wesley had become increasingly unsettled with the Fetter Lane Moravians. And when Philip H. Mother brought over from Germany the theory and practice of Quietism and Stillness, Wesley 'withdrew' with seventy-five followers, and in June 1740 united with his Society at the Old Foundry, which thus became and remained, until City Road was built in 1778, the G.H.Q. of Methodism. But unsettlement and disruption spread.

Whitefield was now in America, busy accumulating funds for his newly founded 'Bethesda' Orphanage at Savannah. During this period of absence, tidings concerning Wesley distressed him considerably. He wrote imploring Wesley to keep their theological differences private, and so avoid public recrimination and schism. He pleaded in vain. Wesley was otherwise minded.

Cennick also was considerably disturbed. It was not long before differences, both psychological and theological, found the two at variance. Cennick tended to Calvinism with its theory of Predestination. Wesley insisted on his theory of Christian Perfection. Both were powerful preachers, and both attracted large crowds who were deeply moved. Strange scenes followed the preaching of both. Devil possession appeared to be the only explanation for the terrible ravings which so frequently attended their gatherings. Wesley welcomed such signs as the birth-pangs of Conversion. Cennick greatly disliked them and did his utmost to discourage them. These diversities in both their temperaments and teachings inevitably brought disunity. In December 1740 the two Johns parted company, Cennick taking fifty-two followers with him away from the New Room to the green fields, their only alternative.

On his return from America in the spring of 1741, Whitefield, finding that his congregation in Bristol had dwindled to a handful and that Cennick was homeless, suggested to him that they should unite their forces in London, where Whitefield was about to replace his wooden Tabernacle by a more permanent structure in Moorfield. Cennick readily consented, and so Bristol was left for London.

#### LONDON (JUNE 1741-DECEMBER 1744)

Cennick now became an officially appointed Preacher at the new Tabernacle, and regarded Whitefield as his chief. His volume of sermons was published by the consent, and with the approval, of Whitefield, who when compiling his new hymn-book incorporated a number of Cennick's hymns, though not before he had suitably improved them!

Strange to say, this new arrangement did not interrupt the frequent visits of Whitefield to America, nor prevent the continuation of Cennick's 'Awakening of Wiltshire'.

In following the careers of Wesley, Whitefield, and Cennick, one is astonished at the *wanderlust* of each of them, especially when one considers the uncomfortable—indeed, unsafe—conditions of road travel in the 1700s. Though Wesley's headquarters were at the Old Foundery in London, Whitefield's at the Tabernacle in Moorfield, and Cennick's, first at the New Room in Bristol, and then the new Tabernacle in London, all of them somehow frequently managed to leave their charges in the care of efficient lay preachers, whilst they went on their various journeys to Scotland, America, Wiltshire, or Ireland.

It was whilst Cennick was in charge of the Tabernacle that the greater part of his Mission in Wiltshire took place. It began in July 1740 and continued to December 1745. Space must be spared for at least one experience of those adventurous years:

June 23 1741. With about 24 horses Brother Howell Harris accompanied me to Swindon. A large company assembled in the Grove to whom I sang and prayed, but was hindered from preaching by a great mob who made a noise and played in the midst of the people, and then, with guns, fired over our heads, holding the muzzles of their pieces so near our faces that we were both as black as tinkers with the powder. We were not affrighted, but opened our breasts and told them we were ready to lay down our lives for our doctrine, and had nothing against it if their guns were levelled at our hearts. They then got the dust out of the highway and covered us all over, and then played an engine upon us, which they filled out of the stinking ditches, till we were just like men in the Pillery; but as they played upon Bro Harris, I spoke to the congregation, and when they turned their engine upon me *he* preached, and thus continued till they had spoiled the engine, and then they threw whole buckets of water and mud over us. . . . This persecution was carried on by Mr Gothard, a leading gentleman of that place, who lent the mob his guns, halbert and engine, and bid them use us as bad as they could, only not to kill us, and himself sat on horseback the whole time laughing to see us so treated. After we had left the town they dressed up two images and called one Cennick and the other Harris and then burnt them.

Cennick's hobby was hymn-writing. He began to write hymns when he was in Bristol. In his *Journal* of July 1739 Wesley notes: 'I corrected Mr Cennick's hymns for the press.' This probably referred to single folders for distribution at his various services. Referring to the winter of 1840, Cennick records:

The people of their own accord met in little companies to sing two hymns which I had printed some time before in Bristol.

Others were printed at the end of some of his sermons. It is astonishing to find that during these provocative and challenging days he was able to publish two collections.

*Sacred Hymns for the Children of God in the Days of their Pilgrimage* was published in 1741. It was made up of Parts I and II, and was followed in 1742 by Part III, a total collection of three hundred and seventy-eight hymns. *Sacred Hymns for the Use of Religious Societies* Parts I and II appeared in 1743 and Part III in 1744, a total collection of two hundred and sixty hymns.

## TETHERTON (SEPTEMBER 1742-DECEMBER 1745)

Although Cennick's ministry at the Tabernacle continued until December 1744, the mission in Wiltshire so progressed that he thought it wise to purchase a house in Tetherton, near Chippenham, with ground sufficient for a chapel, school, and burial-ground. The house served not only as a dwelling for his family, but also as a meeting-place for his assistant preachers and stewards who gathered in conference from time to time. Meanwhile, persecutions had lessened and conversions were multiplied.

Cennick never forgot his ancestry, and gradually learned that he was at heart a Moravian. In his frequent visits to London he had met Zinzendorf, Spangenberg, and Peter Bohler. Their churchmanship and teaching, and above all their Christian simplicity and humble-mindedness, appealed to him. In 1745 he wrote, with significant suggestiveness:

Whosoever understands the nature of religious communions knows that by passing out of one into another, a man does not always reflect some disparagement or censure upon his former society in itself; he may only be convinced, and that maturely, that the other will suit better upon the whole for his individual.

It is therefore not surprising to find a brief note dated 1st December: 'I came entirely out of Methodism.'

He now desired to plan for the future of his Societies, and for himself to qualify for membership in the Moravian ministry. To bring all into the Moravian faith would solve many problems and also set his own divided soul at rest. He called a Conference at Tetherton on 18th December 1745. There the representatives of the various societies signed 'An Invitation to the Brethren to come among them', and promised liberty and authority to them to 'alter, change, or do whatever they should see fit'. The invitation was accepted, and Cennick's Wiltshire Societies became the Moravian Church in Wiltshire.

Cennick was now free from all responsibilities, and in the spring of 1746 he left for Hernhutt.

## IRELAND (JUNE 1746-JUNE 1755)

On his return from Germany, Cennick felt that his first duty was to fulfil a promise to visit Ireland. The following nine years of his work there were by no means unbroken; for they included five visits to England which together accounted for two of them.

At first his work in Ireland was confined to Dublin and the surrounding towns and villages. His Sunday crowds generally reached one thousand; but very soon the enemy began to stir.

Aug 1 1746. Much disturbed by mobs, which increased every week more and more, so that it was dangerous for our people to go out after the Meetings were ended; not a few were hurt by blows, stones, swords, etc., and indeed it was surprising to see what multitudes gathered every evening, so that if some religious soldiers had not guarded me home every night it would have been with great difficulty we could have escaped. . . . We were pelted with dirt, stones, and bricks on all sides by perhaps 15 or 20,000 mob.

Nevertheless, in twelve months the Society in Skinner's Lane had grown to five hundred and twenty in membership.

In the summer of 1748 his visit to the North began.

In 1748 July 23 . . . Br Knight and I took our little bundles upon our backs, and set out on foot for the North, where he continued my companion and fellow sharer in many trials, journeys, necessities, and poverty, and with a cheerful heart, many months.

But again his reception by the common people left much to be desired. Even the clergy were prejudiced and jealous, and complained to their Bishop that Cennick was emptying their churches. 'Preach what Cennick preaches, preach Christ crucified, and then the people will not have to go to Cennick to hear the Gospel,' replied the Bishop, who also promised Cennick protection. 'Well, Mr Cennick,' said he, 'you have fair play in all my diocese.' 'I came back to Ballymenagh,' records Cennick, 'praising the Lord.'

The year 1749 proved a great year for Cennick—greater than he knew. He had made his headquarters at Crebilly, where within the year his Society had grown from six to six hundred. In the September he was ordained deacon of the Moravian Church by Peter Bohler. In November his third hymn-book, *A Collection of Sacred Hymns*, was published in Ireland, and this was followed in 1751 by his fourth collection, *Hymns to the Honour of Jesus Christ composed for such Little Children as desire to be saved*.

During his visits in the vicinity of Ballymenagh he was able to establish a Moravian outpost at Gracehill. Here he came across a young pair of lovers, John Montgomery and Mary Blackley. John was an intelligent and promising land-worker of sixteen. Mary was devoted to her Church. In the fullness of time James Montgomery was born to the devoted pair.

The tide had now turned. Revival spread from county to county. In six years Societies were formed in no fewer than eight counties. Crowds of ten thousand gathered eager to hear him. He became so beloved that clergy and Roman Catholic priests and the common people alike listened to him spellbound.

For some considerable time now Cennick had been feeling that his work was drawing to a close. He had faced countless onsets of drunken ruffians; many nights he had ignored both winds and rains. 'No man could preach so often in damp clothes and draughty barns without paying the penalty.' So wrote his friend, J. E. Hutton.

There was now no alternative but to return home to England. Arriving in Dublin in June 1755, he was able to open the new chapel in Booter Lane which would replace the one in Shooter's Lane. It was his last piece of work. The next day he left for England.

On 28th June 1755 Cennick arrived back in London. He was just able to reach Fetter Lane.

I have scarce eaten, drunk, or slept since I landed. I have had much ado to sit the horse. Those five days were very long ones. How thankful I am that I am got hither at last. I did not choose to lie down in a strange place. I wanted to reach home first.

The fever increased. He became unconscious, and on 4th July, about seven in the evening, he died. His grave is in 'Sharon's Garden', the Moravian Brethren's burial ground in Chelsea.



Let it be remembered that John Cennick came from a strangely blended theological stock. His ancestors were Moravians; his grandparents became Baptists; his parents were Anglicans; he himself embraced Methodism, but he was always inclining to Calvinism and was never entirely happy until he had returned to his mother Church, the Moravian Brethren. Let it be remembered also that he lived in a very unsettled period of religious experience. The Church of England was tragically ineffective, and Methodism had scarcely attained its majority.

He was a preacher of the Evangelical type, and one who vitalized countless souls for the Kingdom of Heaven. His *Village Sermons* are not yet out of date and are still worthy of serious perusal. He was the spiritual father of young John Montgomery, whose son James became editor, poet, social reformer, and hymn-writer. He himself was the author of approximately six hundred and fifty hymns. Of those which have survived the vagaries of taste and the ravages of time, the two graces, *Before and After Meat*, are well known. If one were limited to six others, they would probably be:

*A good High Priest is come.  
Be with me, Lord, where'er I go.  
Brethren, let us join to bless.  
Children of the Heavenly King.  
Jesus, my all, to Heaven is gone.  
Thou dear Redeemer, dying Lamb.*

And he was only thirty-six years old when he died.

W. S. KELYNACK

<sup>1</sup> The writer desires to express his sincere thanks to Bishop Blandford and Mrs Blandford for allowing him not only to read the original manuscript of John Cennick's journal, written by his own hand, but also to quote from it, and from other valuable manuscripts; also to the Rev. William Partridge, M.A., B.D., Warden of the New Room, Bristol, for his permission to roam about the New Room amongst all its treasures and Wesleyana.

---

## THE BEGINNINGS OF THE METHODIST COVENANT SERVICE

THE ONE major contribution of Methodism to religious liturgy is the order 'For Such as would Enter into or Renew their Covenant with God'. Like most of Wesley's ecclesiastical innovations, it was not an original idea, but an inspired adaptation. At the knees of his marvellous mother he had heard of the value of making an explicit covenant with God; for Susanna Wesley had been brought up among the Puritans, whose every thought was conditioned by the covenant relationship. Covenant theology provided their mental climate; they had their 'Solemn League and Covenant' for the nation, church covenants for their corporate religious life, and a spate of individual signed covenants as seals of their personal devotion to Almighty God. The genius of Wesley's service was that it preserved a method of personal covenanting for individuals and generations whose spiritual temperature was far lower than that of the Puritans, and at the same time fused this personal dedication into a congregational rite. The Methodist Covenant Service became a corporate renewal of individual discipleship.

Although Nonconformity was in his blood, not until 1947 did Wesley make his first experiments with a simple form of covenant service. At the Christmas morning service that year (it commenced at 4 a.m.!) he

strongly urged the wholly giving up ourselves to God, and renewing in every point our covenant that the Lord should be our God.

For several days he preached on this theme, with sermons on Moses' Covenant (Dt 29<sub>10</sub>), Josiah's Covenant (2 K 23<sub>3</sub>), and the Covenant entered into by Judah under Asa (2 Ch 15). This was in London. The following February he used practically the same course of sermons at Bristol, and in July at Newcastle.<sup>1</sup> None of them was published, but the kind of thing that he must have said is revealed by his *Explanatory Notes upon the Old Testament*. On 2 Ch 15 he wrote:

V.12. *Into a covenant.*—The matter of this covenant was nothing but what they were before obliged to. And tho' no promise could lay any higher obligation upon them, than they were already under, yet it would help to increase their sense of the obligation, and to arm them against temptation. And by joining all together in this, they strengthened the hands of each other.

V.15. *Rejoiced at the oath.*—The times of renewing our covenant with God, should be times of rejoicing. It is an honour & happiness to be in bonds with God. And the closer, the better.

We cannot be quite sure that Wesley asked his congregation to make some visible or audible renewal of their covenant on these occasions, but it seems most likely that he did indeed follow the hint contained in 2 K 23<sub>3</sub>: '... and all the people stood to the covenant.' 'Standing to the covenant' became the normal corporate response which Wesley expected from his people. Even so, any such response would be for this one occasion only, an impressive accompaniment of this particular series of sermons on renewing our covenant, rather than an end in itself.

The preparation of the fifty volumes of his *Christian Library* brought the idea much nearer to fruition. This series of extracts from 'the Choicest Pieces of Practical Divinity which have been publish'd in the English Tongue' included a number of pleas for the making of personal covenants, from the pens of Robert Bolton, John Preston, John Howe, and others. In particular, Volume 24 (published in 1753) presented a Puritan best-seller by Joseph Alleine (1634-68), a nephew of Richard Baxter, one of Wesley's predecessors at Lincoln College, Oxford, and an ejected colleague of Wesley's own ejected grandfather. In this posthumous work—*An Alarm to Unconverted Sinners*—Alleine warmly commended the making of a kind of marriage contract 'for better, for worse' with our Lord, and provided both general directions and a form of words. This form of words was repeated in Volume 30 of the *Christian Library*, in Wesley's extract from *Vindiciae Pietatis: or, A Vindication of Godliness*, by Joseph Alleine's father-in-law Richard Alleine (1611-81), together with Richard Alleine's own 'Directions'. Actually *Vindiciae Pietatis* contained the first publication of the basic material of the Methodist Covenant Service, and it was always to Richard rather than to Joseph Alleine that Wesley looked for his inspiration.

In August 1755 various strands of thought and practice were suddenly gathered together in Wesley's mind, and woven into a clearly-discernible pattern. On Wednesday, 6th August, his *Journal* records:

I mentioned to the congregation another means of increasing serious religion, which had been frequently practised by our forefathers and attended with eminent blessing, namely, the joining in a covenant to serve God with all our heart and with all our soul. I explained this for several mornings following, and on Friday many of us kept a fast unto the Lord, beseeching Him to give us wisdom and strength to promise unto the Lord our God and keep it.

*Mon. 11.*—I explained once more the nature of such an engagement and the manner of doing it acceptably to God. At six in the evening we met for that purpose at the French church in Spitalfields. After I had recited the tenor of the covenant proposed, in the words of the blessed man, Richard Alleine, all the people stood up, in testimony of assent, to the number of about eighteen hundred persons. Such a night I scarce ever saw before. Surely the fruit of it shall remain for ever.

A clue to the immediate cause of this long-prepared event is the word 'another'—'I mentioned to the congregation *another* means of increasing serious religion . . .'. On 7th July he had held a 'day of solemn thanksgiving', after reading about such practices in the rather hotch-potch *Historical Collections relating to Remarkable Periods of the Success of the Gospel*, published the previous year by his friend John Gillies of Glasgow. Gillies had also described how the renewal of a church covenant in Massachusetts in 1680 had led to a widespread revival.<sup>2</sup>

From the beginning Wesley took great pains to prepare his followers adequately for this new type of religious exercise. Three or four days of explanation and exhortation preceded the first Covenant Service in London, and the same procedure was followed when he extended the experiment farther afield—at Bristol in October, and at Dublin, where the first Covenant Service was held on Good Friday, 1756. In 1758 Wesley appointed the Friday preceding the great event

as a preparatory day of 'solemn fasting and prayer', with services at 5.0 a.m., noon, and in the evening. Gradually this period of preparation was confined to the covenant day itself, as on Friday, 29th February 1760:

A great number of us waited upon God, at five, at nine, and at one, with fasting and prayer; and at six in the evening we met at the church in Spitalfields to renew our covenant with God.

As yet there was no distinctive shape to the service; Wesley usually commenced with a hymn and a prayer, and then introduced and recited Richard Alleine's five 'Directions' for making or renewing a covenant with God. Nor was there any real liturgy about the actual renewal itself, though we may trace in Wesley's comment on the Bristol service in 1755 a kind of formula which he doubtless used frequently: 'We now solemnly and of set purpose, by our own free act and deed, jointly agreed to take the Lord for our God.' Wesley alone read the form of covenant, and the people signified their acceptance either by standing (the normal procedure), by raising their hands, or by both.<sup>3</sup> There followed a period of prayer and the singing of a hymn.

Charles Wesley prepared no special collection of hymns for Covenant Services, but one included in his *Short Hymns on Select Passages of the Holy Scriptures* (published in 1762) became an immediate favourite, and was popularly known as 'the Covenant Hymn'. This was 'Come, let us use the Grace Divine', on Jer 15: 'Come and let us join ourselves to the Lord in a perpetual covenant that shall not be forgotten.' While conducting a Covenant Service at the 1778 Irish Conference, John Wesley testified:

It was a time never to be forgotten; God poured down upon the assembly 'the spirit of grace and supplication', especially in singing that verse of the concluding hymn—

*To us the covenant blood apply,  
Which takes our sins away;  
And register our names on high,  
And keep us to that day.*

He included this hymn (its original three eight-line verses subdivided into six common metre verses) in the section 'For the Society, Praying' of his famous *Collection of Hymns for the Use of the People called Methodists*, and it still retains its position in Methodism as 'the Covenant Hymn', though one verse has been omitted.

Young Robert Roe thus summed up Wesley's conduct of the 1776 Covenant Service at Spitalfields:

There was an amazing number of serious people, to whom he mentioned the propriety of the meeting, and gave an exhortation; after which, we sealed our engagements by prayer and the Lord's Supper.<sup>4</sup>

This description reveals an essential feature of every Covenant Service from the beginning, yet one which might easily be missed in a casual perusal of Wesley's own references. There was no doubt at all in Wesley's mind that the *Country Parson's Advice* of his Oxford days must be followed, and the covenant

sealed at the Lord's Table. The choice of a focal point for the London gatherings was largely dictated by this consideration. It is true that Wesley wanted a building in which all the London Methodists could assemble at one time, and that for this neither the Foundery nor West Street Chapel was adequate. The disused Huguenot church on the southern corner of the junction of Black Eagle Street and Grey Eagle Street was larger than both of them put together, and no doubt that was one of the reasons for using it. But just as important was the fact that the Spitalfields building was episcopally consecrated, so that Wesley could in good conscience administer the Lord's Supper there to his covenanting people.

Such crowds assembled on these occasions that other clergymen were needed to assist him. At the Covenant Service on Easter Monday, 1757, Wesley was the only ordained minister present, and his *Journal* records:

At five in the evening about twelve hundred of the society met me at Spitalfields. I expected two to help me, but none came. I held out till between seven and eight. I was then scarce able to walk or speak, but I looked up and received strength. At half-hour after nine God broke in mightily upon the congregation. . . . And when I returned home between ten and eleven I was no more tired than at ten in the morning.

Whatever the length of time or the physical strain involved, Wesley was quite clear that Covenant without Communion was incomplete.<sup>5</sup>

Like the Love Feast, the Covenant Service was essentially 'for members only'. Both during Wesley's lifetime and for long afterwards, attendance was restricted to those who could show the doorkeepers either their current class-ticket or a note of admission signed by Wesley (or in later years by one of the preachers). Sometimes the church would empty after a preaching service, to be refilled immediately by those who presented their tickets or notes.<sup>6</sup> Conversion was not a condition of membership, however, but simply 'a desire to flee from the wrath to come'. Both for the unconverted members and for visitors, the Covenant Service frequently proved a spiritual turning-point. Wesley seems constantly to have been impressed with its powerful effects—the same effects that caused Robert Southey to condemn it as 'highly reprehensible'.<sup>7</sup> In 1766 he wrote: 'This is always a refreshing season, at which some prisoners are set at liberty';<sup>8</sup> and in 1784: 'Many found an uncommon blessing therein. I am sure I did, for one.'<sup>9</sup> Hardly a service went by without some such comment:

Many mourned before God, and many were comforted.<sup>10</sup>

Many were filled with peace and joy, many with holy fear, and several backsliders were healed.<sup>11</sup>

It was a solemn season, wherein many found His power present to heal, and were enabled to urge their way with strength renewed.<sup>12</sup>

Several received either a sense of the pardoning love of God or power to love Him with all their heart.<sup>13</sup>

During his extensive travels Wesley might hold Covenant Services on almost any day of the year. For his London headquarters, however, there gradually



evolved the tradition which was later bequeathed to Methodism as a whole. The pattern was first sketched out on Friday, 1st January 1762, and each succeeding New Year's Day witnessed a Covenant Service for the London Methodists at Spitalfields, whatever day of the week it might be. Often it followed a watchnight service held on the previous evening. Then in 1778 came the opening of the City Road chapel, and the transfer to these larger headquarters of the annual gathering (by now the impropriety of administering the Lord's Supper in an unconsecrated building had ceased to trouble Wesley greatly). The new centre speedily led to a new (and permanent) date, the first Sunday evening in the New Year, which was first tried in 1780, and finally settled in 1782.

Every Covenant Service so far recorded by Wesley had taken place in the evening, commencing usually at 5.0 p.m. and often continuing until 9.0 p.m. on account of the many communicants, who sometimes numbered two thousand and were rarely fewer than one thousand. The change to a Sunday made it practicable to commence earlier and so to avoid the late hours unpopular in those days of slow travel and early rising. Accordingly on Sunday, 1st January 1786, Wesley recorded in his *Journal*:

We began that solemn service, the renewing of our covenant with God, not in the evening as heretofore, but at three in the afternoon, as more convenient for the generality of people.

Both in London and elsewhere, Sunday afternoon remained the standard time for the Annual Covenant Service for a century and more.

Strangely enough, not until this later Victorian era did the Covenant Service really achieve its full status as a prescribed form of Methodist liturgy. Up to 1779 no printed material had been available for the service except that in the *Christian Library*, but in that year one of Wesley's preachers, Thomas Lee, published some of Alleine's 'Directions' in a penny pamphlet entitled *Extract from the Thirtieth Volume of the Christian-Library*. In his preface, Lee pointed out that in the Sheffield area he had been accustomed to conduct a Covenant Service in the principal places, and was publishing this extract so that the practice might the more easily spread even to the tiniest country societies. Although in this case there was no question of administering the Sacrament, and although Lee was a senior preacher, there is little doubt that Wesley administered a reprimand for this unauthorized venture into print. The thing had been done, however, and Wesley made the best of a bad job—or perhaps he regarded it as bringing good out of evil—by himself publishing forthwith somewhat fuller *Directions for Renewing our Covenant with God*, an 'official' pamphlet frequently reprinted.

These *Directions*, however, remained a form of spiritual guidance rather than an Order of Service. There was no question of including them among the accepted 'forms' of Methodism, which consisted solely of those contained in Wesley's revision of the *Book of Common Prayer*. This is why American Methodism still has no Covenant Service in its *Book of Offices*, which is based on Wesley's *Sunday Service of the Methodists*. Even in Great Britain, although Wesleyan ministers were urged by the 1854 Conference to 'use all due care in

preparing for that observance', the Covenant Service was not actually included in the Wesleyan *Book of Offices* until within living memory.

In spite of the apparent formlessness of this tradition, there is little doubt that the usage and phraseology of the Covenant Service remained basically the same for one hundred and eighty years, until its drastic revision for the Book of Offices authorized in 1936. The spiritual challenge of the original Directions and Covenant had increasingly been regarded as strong meat, and the present form is certainly more palatable to modern taste. It is much attenuated, but enough remains for all of us to breathe a prayer of gratitude to Almighty God, in this the bicentenary year of its institution, for what Wesley in his eighty-sixth year termed 'a scriptural means of grace which is now almost everywhere forgotten except among the Methodists', and also for the one from whom he had received it as a torch passed down the centuries, 'that blessed man, Richard Alleine'.

FRANK BAKER

<sup>1</sup> Wesley's *Standard Journal*, III.361, VIII.176-9

<sup>2</sup> This was first pointed out by the Rev. Frederick Hunter in the *London Quarterly Review* for 1939, pp.78-87.

<sup>3</sup> W. Myles: *Chronological History of the People called Methodists*, 4th ed., 1813, p.77; J. Nightingale, *A Portraiture of Methodism*, 1807, p.234.

<sup>4</sup> *Arminian Magazine*, 1784, p.19.

<sup>5</sup> On at least one occasion Holy Communion was followed by the renewal of the Covenant. See *Journal*, VII.118.

<sup>6</sup> *Arminian Magazine*, 1784, p.19; Nightingale, op. cit., p.128; W. Peirce, *Ecclesiastical Principles and Polity of the Wesleyan Methodists*, 3rd. ed., 1873, p.99.

<sup>7</sup> *Life of Wesley*, 2nd ed., 1820, II.512.

<sup>8</sup> *Journal*, V.125.

<sup>9</sup> *ibid.*, VI.470.

<sup>10</sup> *ibid.*, IV.158.

<sup>11</sup> *ibid.*, V.43

<sup>12</sup> *ibid.*, VI.135.

<sup>13</sup> *ibid.*, VI.320.

## THE CHRISTIAN COMMUNITY: CREATING PUBLIC CONSCIENCE<sup>1</sup>

THE RECORD of the Christian Church is at once glorious and terrible. On the one hand, there is the remarkable and impressive recital of tokens and wonders, of the beneficent, humanizing, and civilizing influence on the history of Christian men and institutions. Sometimes the results have been spectacular and there has been a swift transformation of whole societies—as in the evangelizing of the cannibal islands of the Pacific, and of the villages among the Untouchables in India; or in such splendid community experiments as those of the Jesuits in Paraguay, or of John Frederick Oberlin in the hills of the Vosges. More often it has been slow work, the gradual upbuilding of custom and law over many generations, the weaning from old barbarities and the substitution of new and better ways. The Irish Penitentials with their conflation of moral theology and secular law remind us that this action and interaction of Church and society is a perilous two-way traffic. But if progress has been slow, hesitant, precarious, these long-term influences have counted enormously, and not least among them catechism and liturgy and pastoral care. In such ways the Christian community has been like salt in the earth, like salt-preserving—handing on what is best in existing human values, like salt enhancing appreciation of the good gifts of the Creator (as in the noble European traditions of Christian painting and music) and like salt, a sign and emblem of true fellowship and human brotherhood.

But, on the other hand, history shows that the salt may lose its savour. There is the disconcerting evidence of an intermittent Christian exhaustion, as recurrent as revival. Moreover, the Church is embodied in history and its energies and impulses do not derive solely from spiritual things. It is not accidental that the great age of Spanish missions coincided with the expansion of Spanish Empire, and declined with it; and the Victorian Protestant belief in the providential alliance of what Livingstone called 'commerce, civilization and Christianity' reads sourly after a hundred years, in an African context. The Church may lean more than it knows on these other sources of political or moral pressure, to its cost, as in the alliance of Victorian Nonconformity with the middle class, and the eclipse of the prestige of the 'Nonconformist conscience' with the disappearance of the Liberal Party. Then great communities of many millions move slowly; they acquire a moral inertia, which makes it always easier for them to relax in some older negative framework than to grasp the new duty, the call to prophetic action, especially in a confused and revolutionary age. Most disturbing of all is the recurring evidence that a living, ethical tradition may become petrified when a new generation neglects to see to its own inward renewal. Then, indeed, the salt has lost all savour save the savour of death, and it is trodden underfoot of men, savagely in some access of anti-clericalism with its fierce *Écrasez L'infame*, or in sullen, cold, hostile indifference. Then, as J. F. Mozley profoundly saw, the world's own heathen conscience is more alive, more truly prophetic than an addled, introverted, self absorbed Christian community with its Pharisaic conscience, 'tame . . . vulgarized, humiliated and chained: with a potent sway over mint,

anise and cummin, but no power over the heart . . . a dethroned conscience deserted by every vestige of rank and majesty'.

It was the famous thesis of Troeltsch that there is in Christian history a polarity between two principles, one world renouncing and the other world affirming. By a typically Teutonic over-simplification he found their embodiment in what he called the 'sect type'—the religious orders of the Middle Ages, the radical groups of the sixteenth century, the modern Free Churches: and the 'Church type'—medieval Christendom and the modern national Established Churches. He seemed to give the prize for ethical creativeness to the small groups, prophetic minorities, often despised and persecuted by their own age, but hostages for the fortunes of later generations. It is refreshing and salutary that more recently an opposite view has been expressed. Thus Professor Ian Henderson has said: 'The Church which influences the moral life of a nation is not the small one that people attend, but the large one that people stay away from.' Professor Hodgson in a University Sermon in Cambridge in 1942 developed the point:

It is to prophets such as Amos, Micah, Isaiah that we have to turn if we wish to find Biblical precedent for interference in social, economic and industrial or political affairs. . . . Our Lord and his disciples were not in a position to interfere, as those prophets were. When the prophets prophesied, they spoke as representatives of the God whom king, nobles and people all professed to worship.

So far, so good. Many examples from modern Church history support this view. The prophetic interviews of Martin Niemöller and Hitler, of Pastor Bodelschwingh and Goering, of Otto Dibelius and Herr Kerrl have unhappily no parallel in the war record of the German Free Churches. But when Professor Hodgson continues, 'only an established Church is in a position to be prophetic', some further comment seems necessary. For it is also true, and of this too the Old Testament and modern Church struggles give examples, that only Established Churches can bring forth false prophets, and some of them have an unhappy way of disestablishing their truly prophetic voices.

And Amaziah said to Amos, 'O thou seer . . . flee away, into the land of Judah . . . and there eat bread, and prophesy no more at Bethel, for it is the king's sanctuary and it is a royal house.'

The superb peroration with which Newman ended his sermon on the parting of friends, and his career as an Anglican priest, is a poignant reproach on the inability of the great Church to find room for its prophetic spirits—

as if they had no claim but on thy patience, self-possession and vigilance, to be rid of them as easily as thou mayest.

And when Canon Smyth glosses Professor Hodgson with the comment—

a Church which is not established cannot perform the function of a conscience for the whole community, and in fact enjoys no *locus standi* in these matters,

one is driven to ask whether an official standing based on human authority and human law, and from which our Lord and the College of the Apostles

were excluded as not in a position to interfere, can really be what Christians have understood as the prophetic vocation.

As a member of the one Free Church tradition which has consistently supported the Establishment, and at a time when the maintenance of an Established Church renders an invaluable service to all the Churches in this country, and when it would seem disastrous to cut the painter between a secularized nation and its Christian past, I cannot believe that overstatements serve the good cause, and would rather turn to the noble words of Frederick Denison Maurice:

To tell the rulers of the nation, and all the members of the nation, that all false ways are ruinous ways, that truth is the one stability . . . to make men tremble at the voice of God speaking to them in their consciences . . . this should be the meaning of a national Church.

And here we may remember the wise words of another University preacher:

We often hear impressive language about 'the corporate conscience', the 'national conscience', the 'civilized conscience', the 'mind of the Church', as if these were grander and more authoritative spiritual forces than the individual conscience or mind, whereas in truth they owe their whole moral authority to the fresh and continued approval of individual consciences, without which they would vanish.

Puritanism is the signal illustration of this truth. The Puritans knew that the good fight of faith is lonely and vehement, that the front line of the whole Christian warfare runs through the conscience of the individual, that here all is at stake. But beginning there he adventured into a pattern of social ethics, expressed in a notable literature of devotion and of casuistry. The seminal works of the two Cambridge Puritans, William Perkins and William Ames, may now seem as recondite as some seventeenth-century manual of musketry tactics, but their impress was deep on the mind of two generations in England, in New England and in Massachusetts Bay. Perkins belonged to the 'Church' type. William Ames was no separatist, but of that rare vintage of Congregationalist which professed to discover in the Church of England all the essentials of true congregationalism, albeit somewhat heavily disguised. But it is among the Puritan left, in Thomas Helwys and Roger Williams and John Milton that we find the Christian rationale of toleration, and Lord Lindsay has made famous his view that the essentials of Christian democracy were first embodied in the self-governing communities of the 'gathered Churches' and among the Levellers of Cromwell's army. If history has not done justice to the Puritans, it may be that they did not do justice to themselves, and that they overlaid with narrow pieties and fustian integuments a great weight of solid integrity and heroic Christian virtue. And if we ask how it was that a few thousand of them laid deeper impress on the American way of life than many millions of later immigrants, part of the answer lies in Perry Miller's comment:

About ninety per cent. of the intellectual life, scientific knowledge, morality, manners and customs, notions and prejudices was that of all Englishmen. The other ten per cent. made all the difference.

At the heart of the Puritan conscience lay two great conceptions: first, the belief that the Bible is the law of Christ, by which in each generation the deeds of men and nations may be judged; and second, the awareness that history is



moved by the saints, godly men and women who love justice and mercy and walk humbly with their God, and that—

of their seed springs that which forever renews the earth, though it is for ever denied.

A national conscience is not simple. A great community has its own invisible life more complex than a beehive, or an electronic machine, a structure more delicate and intricate than that of a human body. The great climates of human opinion are made up of innumerable formations of thought and feeling and behaviour, always moving, always changing, for ever dissolving and re-forming, according to a spiritual meteorology too little understood. The cultural facts of geography, education, class, occupation split the life of the whole into a myriad compartments, more or less cut off from one another, within which groups of men and women go their ways like the inhabitants of some vast tenement building. Such a community says in effect, 'my conscience hath a thousand several tongues, and every tongue brings in a several tale'.

To speak prophetically to such a community, the Church needs to permeate the whole, either by living there, which is far better, or by intervening, by establishing Christian listening posts, sensitive to each human need, each deep human experience. When there are vast areas where the Church has no such existence or contact, when the Church itself has become dull and insensitive, to speak of the Church as the national conscience becomes dangerous and misleading.

Of these things the Christian share in the great humanitarian revolution in the nineteenth century is an illuminating example. It may be an exaggeration to say that the Church divisions of this country lie within the ancient divisions of the Heptarchy, but it is an understatement to say that there have always been cultural areas in England where Dissent has been in the best position to speak prophetically. And at the end of the eighteenth century there was the Methodist infiltration into the no-man's-land, choked and untended, of the mining areas of Cornwall and Wales, and the industrial North. Yet the Churches were not ready, either individually or all together, for the immense spiritual challenge afforded by the joint impact of the Revolutionary Era and the Industrial Revolution. The Church of England and Dissent were dull and obtuse at the critical point of pastoral care, while the Methodists, engrossed in coping with the ecclesiastical problems of their hardly won respectabilities, lost their golden opportunity to become, in effect, the Established Church of Disraeli's 'other nation'.

The obvious failure is what *Punch* called the 'Telescopic Philanthropy' of Exeter Hall humanitarianism, afire for missions abroad, indignantly alert about slavery, but at home blinded and paralysed by the impersonalities of so-called economic law, and deafened to the cry of pain and the call for justice, because it came from the ranks of a Radical ideology which was atheistic and anti-clerical. But the Christian achievement has lessons for us all. We have the word of Richard Oastler that there was genuine excuse for Christian ignorance of what went on in the factories, as modern Christian Germans were innocent of concentration camps. Yet in the end ignorance is no excuse, for Christian charity involves a compassionate inquisitiveness. 'I like to ask questions and

to see things for myself,' explained the Bishop of Chichester in Berlin in 1945 to his somewhat breathless conductors, as he hustled them from one foetid refugee shelter, one spot of devastated, desolate agony, to another. And this is the great tradition. Lord Shaftesbury and his friends got at the facts, and the Select Committees of the House of Commons, the government commissions on mines and factories, the reports of local authorities all provided facts, millions of them, mountains of blue books, the contents of which were droned out, hour after hour in an often over-wearied House of Commons; and in the end they formed an inescapable indictment before which the most obstinate vested interest had to hang its head. Christian imagination set the facts in a human context, and here a century of novels, from the *Water Babies* and *Uncle Tom's Cabin to Cry, the Beloved Country*, are important. And then, on the basis of facts made known and imaginatively understood, came political and personal action. When Heinrich Wichern spoke at the great Wittenberg Kirchentag in 1848 and called the German Churches to go out to the workers, and to prove their faith, not with deeds and tracts, but with deeds and love, it was a prophetic call; and he and his friends, it may well be, provided the German Church with a social theory more coherent than anything in England, certainly than the cloudy idealism of the Christian Socialists. That political instrument led to a vast difference in the field of action, and yet the underlying similarity is more important. What counts most of all in Christian history is personal intervention, costly and sacrificial, on behalf of men and women where they live. The great philanthropic works of the German 'Innere Mission' are of a splendid piece with the bright succession of Christian Victorians, from Oastler and Shaftesbury to General Booth and Hugh Price Hughes, to the Nonconformist missions, and to the devoted parish priests, Anglican and Roman, who in the last decades of the century went to the dark places in great cities.

And when disaster overtook the pace of reform, in the shape of Asiatic cholera and fearful epidemics, prophetic insight was not lacking. Those who read Kingsley's *Two Years Ago* will not forget his indictment of the West Country Methodists who spoke of disease as a divine visitation for sin, to be passively accepted. It was Kingsley's supreme insight that for three decades in English history cleanliness was not next to godliness, but was godliness itself, as he affirmed in his sermon on the cholera in 1866:

God is visiting us, punishing persons who have been guilty, knowingly or not, of the offence of dirt . . . the outbreak of cholera in London, knowing what we now know about it . . . is a national shame, scandal and sin.

He and his friends had a robust faith in the power of Christ, that is in bracing contrast to the doleful ethical timidities of recent ecumenical theology.

When men and women arise in this land (cried Kingsley) who believe in an ever-present God of order, revealed in Jesus Christ . . . then cholera will vanish away, and the physical and moral causes of a hundred other evils which torment poor human beings, not through the anger of God, but through their own folly and greediness and ignorance.

That was prophetic intervention, the awakening of human consciences. But when His Majesty's commissioners for Mines went into the depths of the

Durham coalfields and found groups of miners singing Wesley's hymns by candlelight, kneeling to pray in the black dust, that was a reminder that the care of conscience is in the end a priestly task—the old, incessant task of bringing peace to the souls of men, and wiping away their tears. And those, in that *pays de mission* of a century ago, were not so much priest-workmen, as workmen priests, a timely thought for us in a country which has a superfluity of progressive parsons but a dearth of instructed lay apostles.

May we hope to see now, in an age when the gravest problems cannot be framed let alone resolved, along denominational or national lines, the beginnings of an ecumenical conscience, the lifting before humanity riven by deep divisions of the emblem of true brotherhood? At least there are Christian listening-posts across that world and athwart those barriers. The latest news from Berlin tells that the unity of the German Church across the Iron Curtain which divides their land has in the last months deeply impressed social groups which for a century and more have been bitterly hostile to organized religion. The World Council of Churches, while not a super-Church, a shadow papacy, might speak with an authority on questions such as that of race, which no national Church, no international denomination could hope to command. Here our Christian duty to the nation must be set against the cardinal fact of the situation, the estrangement of many millions from the Church, and the growing failure of sympathy on either side. The lesson of our tale surely is that the prophetic voice of the Church must go side by side with its pastoral ministry; that woe will betide it if the moralists try to force the pace; and that nagging the nation from Press or pulpit will only end in the ever greater isolation of the Churches themselves, walled off within the ethical pattern of their own decent proprieties. Without charity, all our deeds and all our speeches are worth nothing, but given this divine sustaining energy, immense creative and renewing forces are available to the Christian Community which in the past have moved history, and will move it ever and again. Our paganized generation may have forgotten most Christian truths, but it has remembered sufficient to judge our words by our deeds, and to measure them both by the example of Him who bestrides history as Prophet, Priest, and King. It will not go unheeded of the Church which takes upon itself the form of a servant, and is ready, if need be, to lay down its life for the sheep.

E. G. RUPP

---

<sup>1</sup> A Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge.

## Recent Literature

EDITED BY C. RYDER SMITH

*The Early Church and the Coming Great Church*, by John Knox. (The Abingdon Press, \$2.50.)

All who are concerned for the furtherance of Christian unity should take serious account of this book. Its central thesis is that whilst the New Testament Church is basic, since it is indissolubly linked with the 'event' of Jesus Christ, it is not to be taken as the sole or final standard in the quest for a united Christendom. The development of the Church, particularly in the second century, must be given due weight. The primitive Church was by no means a pattern of unity. Although sharing a common faith and life it was marked by diversity and conflict. The term 'the *reunion* of Christendom' is a misnomer. The real unity of the Church needed to be achieved and visibly embodied. Hence the inevitable movement towards Catholic and institutional forms in canon, creed, and episcopal government (the roots of which lie in the New Testament Church) is an essential part of the whole picture. To attempt to recover the particular historical situation of the first Christian century, though plainly necessary, is not enough. We must 'seek the fulfilment of a historical process'. Dr Knox, an eminent American New Testament scholar, discusses in a most illuminating way the actual normative experience and conditions of the life of the Early Church. Many points of great importance—and of controversy—emerge. For example, the content of the term 'apostle' in Pauline usage needs to be examined, and the degree in which second-century Catholicism was a development and not a distortion of tendencies implicit in the primitive Church. Dr Knox, who is not an Episcopalian, is surely right in his view that episcopacy is integral to any coming union of the Churches. But, while he is careful to dissociate it from its various interpretations, is this enough? It is under interpretation that deep divergences arise, and the crucial question of a satisfying interpretation must ultimately be faced. It is, however, significant that the author has been led by his thorough and objective investigation to the conclusion that 'the institution of episcopacy does represent a true and all but inevitable sequel to the apostolic office and function'. He has rendered signal service to the progress of Christian unity by clarifying some of the issues involved.

H. G. MEECHAM

*Demythologizing and History*, by Friedrich Gogarten, translated by N. H. Smith. (S.C.M., 7s. 6d.)

Neither the opponents nor, in many cases, the supporters of Rudolf Bultmann's project for 'demythologizing' the Gospel have, according to Gogarten, rightly understood what Bultmann has in mind. The supporters too often suppose that it is simply a question of divesting the New Testament faith of the 'mythical' forms in which it is presented, so as to make it acceptable to modern man, while the opponents imagine that by its existentialist reinterpretation of the faith it destroys the historical foundations of Christianity. But in fact, as Gogarten maintains, its primary aim is to reach such an understanding of the faith as is required by the faith itself. If in doing so it removes some of the difficulties in the way of an acceptance of the faith by modern man, that is because it involves, not a denial of historicity, but a more thoroughly historical approach than its critics appreciate. It is largely through the influence of Christianity itself that modern thought is preoccupied with the problem of history, whereas ancient and medieval thought was primarily metaphysical. But the true nature of historical thinking is still insufficiently understood, not least by the anti-demythologizing theologians. One may be permitted to doubt whether Gogarten

himself makes it entirely clear, for his style is by no means of the simplest and the Existentialist vocabulary (on which he certainly sheds some light) is at times deliberately ambiguous. When he claims that what Bultmann and he are after was already realized by Luther, one can only reflect that Luther did not use such ugly (and misleading) words as 'demythologizing' and that he knew how to write with a simplicity and clarity in which it would be well if modern theologians would take him for their model. Nevertheless, Gogarten has made an important contribution to the discussion of a very important issue; and it is as a contribution that he offers it, not as the last word on the subject.

PHILIP S. WATSON

*One Body in Christ*, by Ernest Best. (S.P.C.K., 25s.)

The sub-title specifies the precise subject of this book. It is 'A Study in the Relationship of the Church to Christ in the Epistles of the Apostle Paul'. All the Epistles are taken as Pauline, except Hebrews and the Pastorals. The book consists of a detailed exposition of every passage in these epistles where the dominant theme is the relationship of believers to Jesus Christ. Indeed, every phrase and metaphor which seeks to express some truth about this relationship is carefully discussed. The book begins with a detailed study of such phrases as 'in Christ', 'with Christ', and 'into Christ', with a special chapter on the contrasted phrases 'in Adam' and 'in Christ' and the implications arising from the contrast. Then follow three chapters on the meaning of the phrase, 'the Body of Christ', its special significance in Colossians and in Ephesians receiving a chapter each. Other metaphors which are investigated are—'members of Christ', 'the building of Christ', and the 'Bride of Christ'.

This is a most thorough study, not least because the apposite comments of scholars, both British and Continental, are faithfully recorded. Dr Best shows that behind all Paul's thinking there lies the basic assumption of the Community of Christians, related to Christ in the closest possible way. The publishers' advertisement warns us that 'not everyone will agree with the conclusions reached in this book', and many readers will be astonished to find on p. 78: 'The Church, or the community of believers, is thus identical with Christ; the Church is Christ', an opinion repeated on p. 110. This extreme judgement arises from a tendency to treat Paul's vivid, illuminating metaphors as if they were the solemn, well-considered pronouncements of a credal statement. A metaphor pressed beyond its immediate significance in its own context becomes a very untrustworthy guide. We find ourselves dissenting from Dr Best at other points, too. We should agree with Deissmann's view of the meaning of 'in Christ' as against Dr Best (on p. 9). Surely he is wrong when he says that there are several cornerstones in a foundation. Is not the cornerstone the very first stone of the foundation, from which all the lines of the building, horizontal and perpendicular, are taken? (p. 165). Is the writer right in rejecting out of hand the interpretations of 'dying with Christ' and 'rising with Christ' as experiences repeated in the life of the believer? (p. 56). Dr Best would have served us better if in the chapter on Conclusions he had summarized first the teaching of the Apostle, and then clearly separated his own opinions. Spite all criticism, however, at a time when Christian Unity is a growing concern among Christian people, it is a good thing to have Paul's teaching about the Church so carefully investigated, and those who are studying the New Teaching on this subject will need to take into account this exhaustive piece of research. The publishers are to be congratulated on a beautifully-produced book.

C. LESLIE MITTON

*Conscience in the New Testament*, by C. A. Pierce. (S.C.M., 8s. 6d.)

This book, by a Cambridge College chaplain, is well described by its sub-title: 'A study of *Syneidesis* in the New Testament; in the light of its sources, and with



particular reference to St Paul: with some observations regarding its pastoral relevance today.' It has long been said that this word, usually translated 'conscience', was drawn by Paul from Stoic sources. Mr Pierce, by means of a careful examination of all the biblical instances and a large number of non-biblical instances of the use of this word and its cognates, explodes this notion completely, and shows that it was an 'everyday' word which belonged to 'folk-wisdom' rather than to 'popular philosophy'. While Paul had the word forced upon him by the use which his opponents made of it at Corinth, he subsequently made occasional use of it for his own purposes. It means primarily 'the painful reaction of man's nature, as morally responsible, against infringements of its created limits', and it is thus related to the 'wrath' and to the 'sword'. But the modern use of the word, in both popular and learned circles, takes it as a guide to future conduct, and we are frequently exhorted to act as it dictates. In the concluding observations conscience in this sense is shown to be a wholly unbiblical concept, and is vigorously denounced as an idol, indeed an abomination, the cult of which has led to the modern decline in church-going. The conclusion is that the Church should give more positive guidance on conduct. The book maintains the high standards of the 'Studies in Biblical Theology', though much of it is more technical than many of those volumes. The challenging conclusion, which is of more interest to the general reader, deserves careful consideration; we wish Mr Pierce would write on it more fully.

A. RAYMOND GEORGE

*Esther, Song of Songs, Lamentations*, by G. A. F. Knight. (Torch Bible Commentaries, S.C.M., 7s. 6d.)

All three of these books are difficult books on which to write a 'religious' commentary. The first two are almost notoriously the least religious of all the Bible books, and both were very nearly excluded by the Jewish Rabbis who officially fixed the Canon. The only way in which a Christian message can be got out of them is by putting it into them by allegorizing and by a bold use of typology. This is what Professor Knight does, though by no means in a fundamentalist manner. In his introductory notes to each of the three 'rolls' the author provides admirable short summaries of recent study, and then proceeds to develop a Christian message. In the case of the Song of Songs, he boldly allegorizes after the manner of the Jewish Rabbi Aqiba of the second century A.D., who saved the book for the Bible, and of the medieval St Bernard. Indeed, if Esther and the Song are to have a Christian message, I do not know any other way of obtaining it. The treatment of the third roll, Lamentations, can be indicated by the phrase 'suffered under Nebuchadnezzar, was crucified, dead, and buried'. Professor Knight refers to 'Israel's Easter Saturday', and I find this section of the volume to be most helpful.

NORMAN H. SNAITH

*Sancta Sanctorum, Prayers for the Holy of Holies*, by W. E. Orchard. (Dent, 12s. 6d.)

All but forty years ago this reviewer heard Dr Orchard preach. What stands out in memory was the sweep of his treatment of a great text, one trenchant phrase, and an offertory collect. Such collects are surprisingly hard to compose with brevity, dignity and the real note of sacrifice. It was apparently spontaneous. In *The Temple, a Book of Prayers*, still in print in its twelfth impression, is found the key. It contains Orchard's prayers for the sanctuary composed for, and revised after, pulpit use. In this book the successive steps of the approach to God include petitions for seekers and for finders but, as the publisher observed, there was no word for use in the Holiest Place of All. After a month's consideration Orchard suggested the inclusion of a dozen blank sheets, for the Sancta Sanctorum 'nor tongue nor pen can show'. Yet now the request is met, forty years later. The aged Roman priest offers what the youthful Presbyterian prophet withheld. The first person plural of 'The Temple'

is replaced by the first person singular; the Roman discipline forms much of the framework of expression; the book is priestly, though in no narrow sense. The intensely personal, when it rings true, is always universal. This priesthood, as the author emphasizes in his Foreword, is the priesthood of all believers. It is a moving book by a very humble man. Trenchant phrase is here, and sweeping thought, but there are new depths.

W. G. FINDLAY

*Rediscovering Prayer*, by John L. Casteel. (Hodder & Stoughton, 12s. 6d.)

This book, by a professor of homiletics, is a general introduction to the theory and practice of Christian prayer. The first half of the book deals with the main types of prayer (a chapter each on adoration, confession, petition, etc.) and the intellectual problems associated with them in the minds of thinking people today. The second half deals with the practice of prayer and considers such matters as the time and place for private prayer, the use of devotional literature, the general discipline of our lives so that we may be released into the continuing practice of God's presence, and the relation between the life of prayer and our daily work. The book ends with a chapter on group-praying, both in the public worship of the Church and in smaller fellowships within the Church, and some observations on growth in prayer. The author gives familiar guidance. He writes with freshness on matters concerning remote preparation, and makes the important point that the way we spend our money is very relevant to the task of acquiring a recollected spirit. He emphasizes that the problem of finding time for prayer is basically solved only by decision as to the goal for which we are willing to spend ourselves. But the book as a whole is not very satisfactory. The more general theological points could well have been omitted from a small book such as this, so that more space could have been given to practical instruction on how to pray. The quotation references at the end of each chapter reveal an odd collection of sources. A book on prayer is better served by references to St John of the Cross and St Francis de Sales than to Bernanos, Rilke, Browning, Edward Carpenter and Boswell.

J. NEVILLE WARD

*A Diary of Readings*, by John Baillie. (O.U.P., 15s.)

We have all long been grateful to Professor Baillie for *A Diary of Private Prayer*, and he has often been asked to write a similar book. This new devotional book of his is not, however, a book of prayers, but, as its sub-title says, 'An anthology of pages suited to engage serious thought, one for every day of the year, gathered from the wisdom of many centuries'. All the classics are here, from Augustine to Bunyan and from Fénelon to Alexander Whyte; there is a scattering of poets, more than a handful of moderns, and an occasional unexpected but valuable page from a writer who is little known. For some purposes and in some subjects the using of an anthology is a custom of doubtful wisdom; but as a help to daily meditation and prayer it is of considerable value, and those who use this one will find on every page something to nourish and refresh their souls.

J. ALAN KAY

*Smoke on the Mountain*, by Joy Davidman. (Hodder & Stoughton, 7s. 6d.)

*Toward a Theology of Evangelism*, by Julian N. Hartt. (The Abingdon Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.)

*The Whole Armor of God*, by Ralph W. Sockmann. (The Abingdon Press, via The Epworth Press, \$1.)

*The Burden of the Lord*, by Ian Macpherson. (The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

*Prophetic Preaching*, by E. Gordon Rupp. (Berean Press, 2s.)

The first three books, in their very different ways, testify to the manifold and developing vitality of American Christianity. *Smoke on the Mountain*, a Christian exposition of the Ten Commandments, by a Jewess converted from Communism, gives us a

new look at the Old Law, that 'shining rainbow bridge stretching between earth and heaven'—a law that is not destroyed but fulfilled in Christ. This is a searching and exciting book, written in a poet's lucid and vigorous prose, with sentences on every page from which old truths flash into sudden life. *Toward a Theology of Evangelism* is not altogether easy to read, partly because of its style. For instance, the word 'actuality' (usually 'concrete') recurs with the rhythmic monotony of an incantation, and the reader's mind is liable at any moment to trip over a sentence like this: 'The Church's dominant interests are in a productive synthesis of cultural and human interests, and in the focus, the point of decisive orientation, of the synthesis as a whole.' It is also rather odd to find in a book on Evangelism only one, and that an incidental and somewhat cavalier, reference to the Cross. But the writer has a number of penetrating and suggestive things to say on the motives and manners of Evangelism, and he distinguishes acutely between the authentic preaching of the Gospel and various spurious substitutes, such as ecclesiastical aggrandizement, religious salesmanship, the propagation of Americanism, and the like. These insights make it worth our while to wrestle with the language difficulty. Dr Sockmann's series of brief devotional addresses on Eph 6<sub>13-17</sub> speaks a sane, forthright word to Christian people who, as they face the vast perils of our time, are left here not unmindful of the vaster possibilities of God.

The lectures brought together in Mr Macpherson's book were originally delivered to divinity students, and are a thoroughly practical and workmanlike introduction to the task of preaching. There are four rather lengthy chapters, on the Burden, the content of Christian preaching; the Man, the qualities the preacher needs; the Craft, which contains very sound and detailed advice on the preparation of sermons; and the Encounter, the manner of delivering a sermon and conducting worship. Although the book covers the fairly well-trodden ground of homiletics, it does so with balanced judgement, and with such sparkle and verve and such a wealth of illustration that any preacher will find it a most stimulating refresher course, and he will also be recalled to a sense of the awful responsibility that is laid upon him as he undertakes to set forth the Gospel of the Grace of God.

Dr Rupp's Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture *Prophetic Preaching* is itself prophetic preaching. Here are learning, wit, eloquence, passion, all only as pointers to Christ. This is a sermon in the true apostolic tradition, in which an idiom altogether individual and contemporary becomes a vehicle of the ageless Word. G. E. LONG

*A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland*, by William D. Maxwell. (O.U.P., 15s.)

Dr Maxwell has already done us all great service by his writings about the Reformed tradition of worship, and in these six Baird Lectures he not only re-emphasizes some of the facts which he set out in earlier books, but helps our understanding in new ways. He traces the forms of worship in Scotland from the earliest times of St Ninian and St Columba, through the Middle Ages, the days of the Reformation, the tempest and chaos of the National Covenant, and the period following the Restoration, to the Renaissance of Worship that began about the year 1750. On the whole it is a melancholy story. At the Reformation worship did indeed take a great step forward, but in later days it was regulated, not by religious insight, but by ecclesiastical and political bias. An unholy 'cussedness' rejected anything that was thought to be associated with England or episcopacy. This did no damage when it was merely a matter of Presbyterians wearing blue gowns because Episcopalians wore black ones, but it became a menace when the Lord's Prayer, the Doxology after the Psalms and the Apostles' Creed were abandoned as 'obnoxious prelatric superfluities'. Hog of Carnack even called the Lord's Prayer 'an engine of hell, not only far contrary to the divine prescript, but likewise perverse to the Gospel of Christ'. Another dismal

feature was the treatment of penitents which endured for some two hundred years after the Reformation. It may have enlivened the services, but it is difficult to find anything good to say about the jugs and branks near the church door, the whippings in the streets, the 'repentance stool' (normally a large raised platform of pulpit or gallery height), where the penitents stood in sackcloth and were lengthily exhorted by the minister, and the system of spying and informing upon one's neighbours that all this engendered. Even in later days, during what Dr Maxwell calls the 'Renaissance of Worship', one has to reckon with psalmody 'dismal beyond description', scenes of wild mob rule resulting from the installation of organs, and such resistance to the reading of the Scriptures as made men say: 'The reading of the Bible in church is a mere waste of time. We can read our Bibles at home.' But if the story is not an encouraging one, it is well and faithfully told, with good contemporary descriptions of prayers and services, and a fund of information about many curious subjects that are touched on by the way. It deals interestingly and authoritatively with a chapter in the history of worship that is less well known than some, but without which our understanding of the whole subject would be seriously incomplete. J. ALAN KAY

*The Birth of Modern Education*, by J. W. Ashley Smith. (Independent Press, 19s. 6d.)

The somewhat ambiguous and misleading title of this book is followed by a kind of modifying description that clarifies its scope and subject: 'The Contribution of the Dissenting Academies, 1660-1800.' By the Clarendon Code and the Test Acts of the reign of Charles II Dissenters were excluded from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and English university education was denied to them until the establishment, in 1836, of the University of London, which opened its doors to all and sundry. During that century and a half many of the excluded scholars, including some who had been educated in foreign universities, set up private academies for the education of Dissenters, both ministers and laymen. This book is a record of their work and of the men who founded or laboured in them. It will appeal first of all to the educationists, since the main emphasis is on the framing of the curricula. The author shows how even the ejected Oxford and Cambridge scholars who established the earliest academies often departed from the university tradition, while others frequently imported ideas which 'they themselves had picked up in universities abroad'. He gives in detail the curricula of several academies, and devotes one chapter to the tutors, who 'seem to have tried to construct the ideal curriculum, with necessary consideration of, but no unnecessary deference to, the traditional ideas'. In all this there is, as he himself suggests, rich food for thought for those who are concerned with reforms in the university and sixth-form curriculum today. The general reader will be mainly interested in the founders and tutors themselves, many of them but vaguely known to him, some probably not known at all. Philip Doddridge is here, and John Wesley and John Newton, who worked at Newport Pagnell with that other (endearingly eccentric) friend of Cowper, William Bull; and Daniel Defoe makes an appearance as a pupil of the early academy established by Charles Morton at Newington Green. The book is scholarly, carefully documented, and written in pleasant lucid prose; it should be read and studied by all who are interested in, and proud of, the contribution of Nonconformity to English education. G. H. VALLINS

*A History of Christianity in Yorkshire*, edited by F. S. Popham. (Religious Education Press, 8s. 6d.)

This book, prepared primarily for teachers, has the interesting aim of encouraging the study of local church history against the background of nation-wide movements. Beginning with the accession of Constantine, which took place at York in A.D., 306, the story of the Church's growth up to the present day is traced by different writers.

From their accounts it is possible to find out interesting facts about the place of the church in the life of the county, the origin and maintenance of the parish registers, the religious origin of the schools, and the church's support for such humanitarian objects as the Anti-Corn-Law League. The independence of the Yorkshire character is seen to express itself in the development of Nonconformity, and the chapters about the Moravians and Yorkshire Methodism are among the best. Although the authors have written in Yorkshire libraries, they have looked out on a wide landscape of Church history past and present—and even future, for the last words on the ecumenical movement and what it has meant in the life of the church in Leeds today, give hope that the best is yet to be in the story of Yorkshire Christianity. A. H. KAY

*John Wesley and the Eighteenth Century*, by Maldwyn Edwards. (The Epworth Press, 10s. 6d.)

'Christianity is essentially a social religion, and to make it into a solitary one is to destroy it. . . . The gospel of Christ knows of no religion but social religion; no holiness but social holiness . . .', wrote John Wesley. But his conception of 'social religion' had none of the political connotation that phrase has for us today. Yet Wesley's influence upon the masses in his own and the succeeding century created an entirely new political situation and issued in and helped to achieve new ideals of political government. For an understanding of John Wesley's personal political attitude and actions this book of Dr Maldwyn Edwards' is invaluable. It has the completeness, detailed accuracy and fairness of comment we have learned to expect from him. First written in 1933, it is now presented in a new and revised edition. It reminds Methodists that their founder was, in his main emphasis, a wiser man than he knew. As Dr Edwards states, 'Wesley did not differ in essentials from his fellows, but whereas they conceived man's salvation to lie in a reconstructed Society, he believed it to lie in a regenerated will. . . . Wesley relied on the transformed energy of the individual.' . . . 'He stood consistently for righteousness in social and political life. That is why his narrow Toryism and his unfounded optimism in the Constitution of his day are now forgotten.'

RALPH KIRBY

*One Man's Vision*. (Allen & Unwin, 10s. 6d.)

This is the story of the Joseph Rowntree Village Trust, published in celebration of its Jubilee. It is a soberly told, yet stirring, tale of pioneer work in house planning and site design, and tells how an able Quaker man of affairs set himself to help folk of limited means to go about the management of pleasant, well-planned houses, not as a piece of pious charity, but as an economic measure. It shows how the 'J.R. spirit' planned fifty years ago not only to produce in New Earswick houses artistic, sanitary and thoroughly well-built (though within the means of men earning about 25s. a week), but also a community responsible for its own affairs. This 'one man's vision' had no rigid plan, no unyielding framework. It was a living thing, with resilience enough to meet the rapid social changes of its fifty years of life,—changing populations, changing standards, the impact of National Housing policies, and so on. The story is told with a Quaker restraint and a notable objectivity. There are diagrams and a wealth of illustrations, some in attractive colour. This book is not a history only, but a source of inspiration to all who share the Quaker 'concern' for 'the condition of the people' problem.

J. WILSON WHEELER

*War, Communism and the Christian Faith*, by Percy Harthill. (James Clarke, 4s. 6d. and 6s.)

Many books about the Christian attitude to war, whether written by pacifists or non-pacifists, are more notable for warmth of feeling than depth of thought, but this



is not one of that kind. Not that the author is cold or detached—he writes, indeed, with the drive of strong conviction—but he is informed with sound knowledge, is scrupulously fair to those with whom he disagrees, and is both ready and able to think hard. The result is a book that is clear, logical and convincing. Moreover it does not merely repeat the old arguments, but has some new things to say, even about such matters as the relationship between war and communism, the suffering of the innocent, the Catholicity of the Church, the absolute moral standard, the choosing of the lesser evil, and 'the just war'. It makes a real contribution to the discussion, and those on both sides will have to take account of the arguments it advances.

J. ALAN KAY

*Kant's First Critique: An Appraisal of the Permanent Significance of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, by H. W. Cassirer. (Allen & Unwin, 30s.)

Many will remember the *Critique* as a stumbling-block. It really is one, being probably the worst written major modern philosophical work, with Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* as a very close rival. In his prime Kant wrote well, but age made him crabbed and pedantic, so that even Germans find the language of his masterpiece difficult. Still, we have to bear in mind that he was here trying to give expression to a radically new type of doctrine (which has had repercussions outside philosophy, notably in the theology of Ritschl). The difficulty of the *Critique*, its historical importance, and its searching effect on anyone who sincerely grapples with it, make any competent book on it welcome. Dr Cassirer comes from a German background, but he has acquired a British liking for simple statement, and has indeed succeeded in re-expressing many of Kant's points with engaging clearness. Breaking with tradition, he passes over most of the detail of Kant's crowded text, considering only the main stages and tendency of the new doctrine. Without the slightest suggestion of disrespect he firmly and convincingly dismisses the deduction of the Categories and of the Ideas of Pure Reason. With regard to the former he sees that what Kant was in fact arguing was the necessity, not of his twelve Categories, but of the basic laws of the Newtonian physics. As for the Ideas, by rejecting Kant's odd derivation of them, he saps Kant's contention that theoretical reason necessarily lands us in antinomies when we try to think about the universe. Yet Dr Cassirer's main purpose is, through critical but sympathetic exposition, to show that Kant's leading thesis—that knowledge involves an *a priori* as well as an empirical factor—is unanswerable. The book is another symptom of a growing discontent with the parochialism, and the avoidance of epistemological (as of ontological) problems, that have marked English philosophy during the last twenty-five years. It is well written, courteous in controversy, and modest in spirit. Had it been half as long, it would, I am sure, have been more effective.

T. E. JESSOP

*Spiritual Values in Shakespeare*, by Ernest Marshall Howse. (The Abingdon Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.50.)

Dr Howse is minister of a church in Toronto, a graduate of more than one university, and a journalist. The present book is a by-product of his ministry. His congregations have included a considerable number of students to whom he has lectured on week-nights on literary subjects, with due regard to the deeper issues of life and conduct. The homiletic approach to literature is full of pitfalls. In his determination to extract moral lessons from literature, the preacher tends to over-simplify, to distort, to credit writers with having the same 'improving' purpose as himself—to forget, in short, that art is far more subtle and complex than preaching. Dr Howse does not fall into this trap. He rightly claims that the plays of Shakespeare are religious

in the spirit of their approach to the meanings of life, and that it would be impossible to imagine their being produced 'save in a culture influenced by the Hebrew prophets and Jesus', but he does not go beyond this. He does not even claim that Shakespeare was specifically a Christian. In his interpretation of the tragedies he leans, as everyone who now writes about them must, on Bradley, insisting that though circumstance plays its part in them, they are not, like the Greek tragedies, dramas of circumstance, but are played out in the deeper region of moral choices. His exposition is concerned with the nature of the choices made, and if he ignores all the ingenious novelties of modern criticism, as he does, he is only the more convincing. W. S. HANDLEY JONES

---

# From My New Shelf

BY C. RYDER SMITH

*Christian Faith Today*, by Stephen Neill (Penguin Books, 2s. 6d.). Bishop Neill has done a thing that much needed to be done and he has done it with consummate skill. His book is 'a reasoned approach towards solving those difficulties which men feel cloud their understanding of Christianity today', especially well-educated men. He does what he 'has tried' to do, 'handles the material honestly, evades no difficulty, understates rather than overstates conclusions, and indicates the cumulative process of investigation'. The scope of his knowledge is extraordinary. He uses his experience of India again and again with great effect. He has a way of saying much in a few words, e.g. 'the apologist is an evangelist in chains', 'apparently man thrives on difficulty', 'the characteristic (of the Old Testament prophet) is insight', 'Marxism has developed a kind of mythology of the sinless proletariat', 'Man's tenure upon earth is not freehold but leasehold'. There is one slip. Muhammad was born at Mecca and died at Medina, not vice versa. And one phrase puzzles me. Is it true that Jesus did not 'lose His perfect serenity' in Gethsemane or when the Cry of Dereliction broke from His lips? The author often uses Bishop Butler's method of argument from analogy, but his clarity is as notable as Butler's obscurity. Like the latter, he is convincing because he does not try to prove too much. His purpose is to show that, when every difficulty has been faced, Christianity is still a 'religion for reasonable men'. But, when he has shown this, he brings every reader up to the question 'What are you going to do with Jesus?' This book is a treasure—and it costs just half a crown.

*The Spirit and the Bride*, Whitsun Meditations, by J. Ernest Rattenbury (The Epworth Press, 3s. 6d.). Two of the chief elements in the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit are that He is the Spirit of *Christ* and the Spirit of *Love*. In the main it is to 'Christ' and 'Love' that Dr Rattenbury gives himself in the latest of his 'meditations'. There is no need to say that *his* exposition throbs. He bases the greater part of the exposition on the Chapters of the Upper Room in the Fourth Gospel, the greatest passage in the Bible. As usual, there is a felicitous use of hymns. I quote a footnote: 'By Spirit I do not mean influence or perfume or any abstract quality. I mean personality.'

*The Deep Things of God*, Essays in Liberal Religion, by Sidney Spencer (Allen & Unwin, 8s. 6d.). In this book the Principal of Manchester College has gathered twenty-two brief and lucid essays, originally written for periodicals, under the titles 'Problems of Theology', 'Mysticism', 'Jesus and His Teaching', and 'Religion and Society'. The author is a Unitarian, but very much of what he says will be helpful to others.

*Rivals of the Christian Faith*, by L. H. Marshall (Carey-Kingsgate Press, 12s. 6d.). In this series of 'Whitley Lectures' for 1952 the late Principal of Rawdon College begins with a chapter called 'the Starting Point', in which he 'maintains that the sense of moral obligation, of transcendent constraint is a "divine imperative", evidence of the pressure of the spirit of the Living God upon our lives'. Four lectures follow, on Greek Rationalism, Roman Stoicism, Scientific Humanism, and Russian Communism, and the book ends with a chapter on 'The Christian Answer' to the 'moral demand' that confronts every man. Dr Marshall's life-long friend, Rev. Henry Bonser, has contributed a brief memoir, and there is a portrait.

*Men Seeking God*, by Christopher Mayhew (Allen & Unwin, 12s. 6d.). This book is 'based upon a series of TV programmes', which presented six 'personalities',

belonging respectively to each of the great world religions. Each chapter, beginning with a short description of the life and work of the chosen representative, includes also a verbatim record of Mr Mayhew's interview with him, a short anthology of his favourite 'scriptural' passages, and a number of good photographs. The six are a Lahore Moslem, a Calcutta *swami*, a Rangoon Buddhist, a London Jew, a Bengali Methodist, and an American Franciscan, resident in Rome. Each of them tells us what his religion means to him personally, and, both by what he is and what he says, he shows it at its best. Mr Mayhew has added a chapter of 'conclusions'. As to the unity of all religions he can only say 'Perhaps (the different religious experiences of the six) are all glimpses of the same Reality'. (On p. 81 should not 'Hanbury-Smith' be 'Ambery Smith'?)

*The Salt of the Earth*, by André Froissard, translated by Marjorie Villiers (Harvill, 10s. 6d.). This book describes seven of the great Roman Orders—Benedictines, Cistercians, Carthusians, Carmelites, Dominicans, Jesuits and Franciscans. The volume is interesting, informative, selective, and challenging. It is interesting, for the author has a light touch and there are good stories and vigorous woodcuts. It is informative, and therefore useful, for, as the author says, there are very many people, particularly Protestants, who know nothing of the Orders. It is selective, telling the good part of the truth, and only very rarely hinting that there has ever been anything wrong with the Orders. The chapter on the Jesuits, for instance, suggests that they have always been right. As the writer's purpose, quite rightly from his point of view, is to commend the Orders, a reader has no right to complain of the book's selectiveness, but he should remember it. Finally, the book is challenging. There have, of course, been many saints in the Orders, as in the Protestant Churches. We thank God for them all,—but is that enough? Mr Peter Anson has supplied an appendix, chiefly to give information about the houses of the Orders in the British Isles and America.

*Religion and the Rational Outlook*, by Surendra Nath Dasgupta (Law Journal Company, Allahabad, 2, Rs. 15). This erudite and sound book will prove valuable to Orientalists, but other readers will find it rather heavy going. In a book of this sort ought not the writer to give references for his quotations?

*John Wesley, Preacher*, by W. L. Doughty (The Epworth Press, 18s. 6d.). Mr Doughty begins by showing that Wesley came of a race of preachers. Preaching was 'in his blood', and, even if there had been no 'warmed heart', I suppose he would have spent no small part of his life in preaching. There is abundant evidence that he loved to preach. He even believed that he owed his health largely to his habit of preaching twice or thrice a day. (It is as well that doctors do not prescribe this cure!) Then there came the famous 24th May,—and after that, 'Necessity is laid upon me, for woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel'. Wesley 'played many parts' in his long life, but Mr Doughty has seen that, first and foremost, he was a preacher, and has happily made this the theme of a book. There is little or nothing in it that is new under the word 'factual'. After the scrutinies of so many, how could there be? But there is a new perspective. I am a fairly well seasoned reader in Wesley, and I have enjoyed this book page after page,—even though it has rebuked me, too. To give specimens of Mr Doughty's wide range, he has chapters, for instance, on Field Preaching, Mobs, Subjects (a topic that bursts the bounds of one chapter), Congregations, Early Morning Preaching, Old Sermons, Sidelights. One can only mention a few details. What pains Wesley took over his voice! In the open-air he could be heard a hundred and forty measured yards away. What was the reaction of the women when he inveighed against 'elephantine hats'? If later preachers' sermons after, say, sevenfold use, were laid aside for a while, would they serve well again,—as with some of Wesley's? Of course, he did not use an old sermon because he was 'gravelled for lack of matter'! There are few illustrations in his printed sermons,

but do not Horace Walpole and Walter Scott give rather surer evidence than Mr Doughty thinks that he told many homely stories? And was his usual 'time' no more than fifteen minutes? In the *Journal* what he says is 'It is strange if I exceed my time above a quarter of an hour'. (On p. 124 'Nelson' should be 'Newton'.) But, of course, all such things are merely circumferential. When Wesley preached, he was set on 'one thing', to 'save souls', and throughout his book Mr Doughty gives the 'one thing' unchallengeable pre-eminence.

*Padre Brown of Gibraltar*, a Memoir, by Ernest E. Taylor (The Epworth Press, 5s.). 'To know him was to love him', writes a British Governor of Gibraltar; 'the best man who ever lived on the Rock', said a Spanish working man. Padre Brown spent twenty-nine years there, and this book tells the colourful story. Life is too short to read the biographies of all the saints, but I am glad that I read this one. There is an excellent portrait.

*Pipe-Line of Power*, by Walter King (Religious Education Press, 4s.). How are we to teach 'teenagers the Old Testament? Mr King, a secondary school master, has done it. How? Well, he shows the true teacher's skill in many ways. Here are samples of one: 'Nelly Brown, get thee into the Girl Guides!'; 'Dismal Jimmy!'; 'When a big chap is bullying a small one and the latter suddenly turns round and punches his nose . . .'. Mr King 'gets it across' all right, and by 'it' I mean religion as well as history. A fine book either for teachers or taught.

*Right and Wrong Ways to Use the Bible*, by J. Carter Swaim (Westminster Press, Philadelphia, \$2.50). This book is written in a conversational style; it teems with good and apposite stories; it shows that the Bible is a living book; and it leads the reader to Him in whom 'all things hold together'.

*What Did the World Council say to You?*, by Harold A. Bosley (Abingdon Press, via The Epworth Press, \$2.00). This 'Interpretation of the Message of the Evanston Meeting' puts its message and its several reports (including the report on the 'theme' of the whole Conference) into such words as are used by ordinary men day by day. The theme was 'The Hope of the World', and the writer is the able Minister of the First Methodist Church in Evanston, where a number of the meetings were held.

*Science and its Background*, by H. D. Anthony (Macmillan, 20s.). This book was first published in 1948. Dr Anthony has added two chapters to bring it up to date. While 'most of the chapters are centred on the work of individual men of science', they are set in a 'continuous history of human affairs'. A large number of charts, maps, diagrams and pictures enrich the book. Men of science have highly praised it; I am not of that ilk, but others who are not, may be glad to know that this is just the right kind of book for the ignorant. Nothing 'dry' here!

#### BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

*Iona Community Pamphlets* (direct from Community House, 214 Clyde Street, Glasgow, C.1): *Is Politics a Dirty Game?*, by Penry Jones (6d.); *The Healing Christ*, by Ian Cowie (6d.); *In Heaven's Name—Politics!*, by Penry Jones (6d.); *Caring for People*, the Church in the Parish, by James Maitland (6d.); *The Place of Healing in the Ministry of the Church*, by George F. Macleod (9d.). . . . *For Christian Beginners*, a Guide, by Leonard P. Barnett (Methodist Youth Department, 3s.). . . . *Morning Worship for Young Children*, by A. T. King (Independent Press, 2s.). . . . *Low Intelligence and Delinquency*, by Mary Woodward (Institute for the Study and Treatment of Delinquency, 1s. 6d.). . . . *Episcopacy Re-asserted*, a Rejoinder to 'The Historic



Episcopate', by E. R. Fairwether (Mowbray, 4s.). . . . *Perplexing Parables*, six broadcasts, by W. Gordon Robinson (Independent Press, 1s.). . . . *Danish Agriculture*, Denmark as a Food Producer, with illustrations (Robert Jorgensen, 71 Piccadilly, W.1, no price given). . . . *Chance and History* (Essex Hall Lecture), by Alan Bullock (Lindsey Press, 2s.). . . . *New Testament Conversions*, a Question Course Handbook for Preachers, etc., prepared by D. P. Thomson, Evangelist of the Church of Scotland (from the author, Barnoak, Crieff, Perthshire, no price given). . . . *In Bible Lands Today* (illustrated), by Frederick A. Tatford (Parkinson's Fellowship Tours, Folkestone, 6s. 6d.). . . . *The Faith of a Protestant*, by W. C. G. Proctor (Reformation Church Trust, 26 Albemarle Street, W.1, 2s.). . . . *The Dead Sea Scrolls and their Significance* (two broadcasts), by H. H. Rowley (Independent Press, 2s.)

## NOTABLE ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

*The Expository Times*, March (T. & T. Clark, 1s. 6d.).

Suggestions on Preaching the New Testament: Some Difficulties of Exposition and Examples of Interpretation, by Arthur A. Cowan.

The Mari Letters (first part), by Cyril J. Gadd.

The Injunctions of Silence in Mark's Gospel (e.g. the 'Messianic Secret'), by James W. Letch. do, April.

The Mari Letters (continued), by Cyril J. Gadd.

Karl Barth, by Thomas F. Torrance.

The Place of the Sunday School in the Life of the Church, by John G. Williams.

The Two Circles of Faith (re God and the Devil), by F. J. Rae.

do, May.

The Holy Spirit, Baptism, and the Laying on of Hands in Acts, by J. E. L. Oulton.

The Ascension, by A. W. Argyle.

Mari and the Old Testament, by J. N. Schofield.

*The Harvard Theological Review*, October (Harvard University Press, via O.U.P., \$1.00).

A Gentleman among the Fathers (Clement of Alexandria), by Morton S. Enslin.

The Development of Augustine's Ideas on Society before the Donatist Controversy, by F. Edward Cranz.

*The Congregational Quarterly*, April (Independent Press, 4s. 6d.).

Is there a Special Affinity between Christianity and Democracy?, by John C. Bennett.

The Future Life in the Thought of the Old Testament (Drew Lecture), by H. H. Rowley.

Newman's *Apologia pro Roma*, by E. L. Allen.

*The International Review of Missions*, April (O.U.P., 3s. 6d.).

Christian Theology and Vedanta (criticizing Radhakrishnan), by W. Perston.

Desideranda Islamica et Christiana, by E. F. F. Bishop.

Oversea Service (preparing laymen to witness in non-Christian countries), by H. B. T. Holland.

Israel at Evanston, by Robert Smith.

*Studies in Philology*, January (North Carolina University Press, via C.U.P., \$1.50).

Shaftesbury's Moral Sense, by Robert B. Viotle.

Mary Shelley to Maria Gisborne: New Letters, by Frederick L. Jones.

Thoreau's Mock-heroics and the American Natural History Writers, by Raymond Adams.

*The Hibbert Journal*, April (Allen & Unwin, 3s. 6d.).

God Helps Him who Helps Himself (Vedanta and the Bomb), by John Levy.

The Cambridge Platonists (especially Whichcote), by A. W. Argyle.

Ends and Means in Education, by E. B. Castle.

The Christology of Kierkegaard and Barth, by J. Heywood Thomas.

*Theology Today*, January (Princeton, via Blackwell, Oxford, 5s.).

The *Filioque* after Nine Hundred Years, by George S. Hendry.

The Gospel and the Younger ('All is Lost') Generation, by Robert G. Middleton.

The Spirit of Righteousness (in Lev 14<sup>22</sup>, etc.), by Norman H. Snaith.

The Main Issues in Theological Education, by H. R. Niebuhr, D. D. Williams, and J. M. Gustafson.

## Our Contributors

---

**FRANK BAKER**  
B.A., B.D., PH.D.

Methodist Minister. Registrar of the Wesley Historical Society and Secretary of the Methodist Historical Society. Author of *A Charge to Keep* and *Charles Wesley as revealed by his Letters*.

**H. CUNLIFFE-JONES**  
B.A., B.D., B.LITT.

Professor of Systematic Theology in the Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford, since 1937, and its Principal since 1947.

**A. RAYMOND GEORGE**  
M.A., B.D.

Methodist Minister. Lamplough Tutor in Systematic and Pastoral Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Wesley College, Headingley, Leeds. Associate Lecturer, University of Leeds. Author of *Communion with God in the New Testament*.

**THOMAS EDMUND JESSOP**  
O.B.E., M.C., M.A., LITT.D.

Professor of Philosophy in the University of Hull since 1928. Vice-President of Conference 1955. Author of *Law and Love*, *Evangelism and Education*, *Social Ethics* (Beckley Lecture), etc. Joint Editor of *The Works of George Berkeley*.

**WILLIAM S. KELYNACK**  
M.A.

Entered the Wesleyan Methodist Ministry in 1902 and retired from active work in 1944. Author of *Making Melody*, *The Companion to the School Hymn Book of the Methodist Church*.

**G. W. H. LAMPE**  
M.C., D.D.

Edward Cadbury Professor of Theology in the University of Birmingham. Examining Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishops of Wakefield, Peterborough and Birmingham. Formerly Fellow, Chaplain and Tutor of St John's College, Oxford. At present primarily engaged in editing the forthcoming *Lexicon of Patristic Greek* (Clarendon Press).

**G. ERNEST LONG**  
M.A.

Methodist Minister. For seventeen years missionary in South India. Tutor in Church History, Handsworth College, Birmingham.

**C. LESLIE MITTON**  
B.A., M.TH., PH.D.

Methodist Minister. Tutor in New Testament Studies at Handsworth College, Birmingham. Author of *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*; *The Formation of the Pauline Corpus of Letters* and *A Clue to Wesley's Sermons*.

**JAMES F. MOZLEY**  
M.A., D.D.

An authority on the Reformation. Author of *William Tyndale*, *John Foxe and His Book* and *Coverdale and His Bibles*.

**E. GORDON RUPP**  
M.A., D.D.

Methodist Minister. Lecturer in Modern Church History in the University of Cambridge and author of *Studies in the English Protestant Tradition* and *Luther's Progress*.

**C. RYDER SMITH**  
B.A., D.D.

Principal, Richmond College, 1929-40. Professor in Theology, London University, 1932-40. President, Wesleyan Methodist Conference, 1931. Author of many theological books.

## **NEW EPWORTH BOOKS**

### **THE FORMATION OF THE PAULINE CORPUS OF LETTERS**

*By C. Lelis Milton, M.Th., Ph.D.*

We know a great deal about the Apostle Paul, and are also reasonably well-informed about the circumstances connected with the writing of his letters. This is an able, scholarly and illuminating discussion of the way in which the Pauline Letters were gathered together.

8s. 6d. net.

### **THE HAND OF GLORY**

*By G. T. Bellhouse, M.A., B.D.*

The sermons in this book are the attempt of one preacher in the course of a regular ministry to try to bring the Word to bear on the needs of the congregation entrusted to his care.

8s. 6d. net.

### **THE KING IN HIS BEAUTY**

*Selection from the Letters and Sermons of Samuel Rutherford*

*By J. Cyril Downes, M.B.E., M.A., B.D.*

Here is the master of language putting Truth into vivid phrases that penetrate the mind, kindle the imagination, and flood the soul with light.

6s. net.

### **THE CHRISTIAN VIEW OF LIFE**

*By A. Price Hughes*

The writer knows through experience of anxiety and bereavement how the Christian view of life brings to the heart the light of truth, the grace of hope and the warmth of love.

3s. 6d. net.

### **THE FOURTH GOSPEL IN RECENT CRITICISM**

*by the late Wilbert F. Howard, M.A., D.D.*

*Revised by C. Kingsley Barrett, M.A., B.D.*

We are fortunate to have gained the agreement of a younger scholar, Mr C. Kingsley Barrett, to prepare a new edition of Dr Howard's book. Mr Kingsley Barrett has added sections of his own to take proper account of recent work on the problem of the Fourth Gospel, and brought the new edition completely up-to-date in all respects.

12s. 6d. net.

### **OVER HIS OWN SIGNATURE**

*A Study of Christ's Pictures of Himself and of their Relevance to our Lives today*

*by Lulie D. Weatherhead, M.A., Ph.D., D.D., D.Litt.*

Dr Weatherhead takes every sentence in the New Testament in which Jesus is reported to have said, 'I am . . .' such as, 'I am the light of the World', 'I am the Bread of Life'—and examines it. These are the words Jesus used about Himself, statements which, as it were, He Himself signed.

10s. 6d. net.

## **THE EPWORTH PRESS**

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1

## **NEW EPWORTH BOOKS**

---

### **FIVE HUNDRED TALES TO TELL AGAIN**

*by H. L. Gee*

A book to read in private or quote in public. Here is humour. Here are epics and anecdotes of famous people and ordinary folk. It is the public speaker's *adieu* *meum*, and all the 500 stories are told as only H. L. Gee can tell them.

12s. 6d. net.

---

### **LIVE AND LEARN**

*by A. Graham Ikin, M.A., M.Sc.*

The essays in this book deal in a commonsense and practical way with the common difficulties, frustrations and hopes of ordinary people; and the author helps them to tackle their failures, relationships with their children, problems of their marriage and adjustments in growing old, with faith, patience and courage.

6s. net.

---

### **I WENT TO MOSCOW**

*by Canon Mervyn Stockwood*

Canon Stockwood went to Moscow to see for himself, and his book records the impressions of a lively and inquiring mind. He saw what and whom he wanted, even interviewing the Patriarch of All Russia.

15s. net.

---

### **RELIGION IN PRISON**

*by J. Arthur Hayes*

Here is an authentic account of the part which Christianity plays in the life of a gaol. Attention is paid not only to services in the chapel and pastoral work in the cell, but also to the effect of Christianity on prison administration.

10s. 6d. net.

---

### **THE METHODIST**

#### **A Study in Discipleship**

*by Henry Carter, C.B.E.*

The outworkings of John Wesley's vital experience in May 1738, included the formation of 'Rules of the Society of the People called Methodists'. The reader will find his heart and mind and conscience stirred in these pages.

5s. net.

---

### **WORDS AND WISDOM**

*Selections from the Writings of Henry Bett*

Dr Bett was not only a scholar and an evangelist but also a man of wide interests and sympathies. Here the discerning reader will find mixed browsing which will both entertain and instruct. There is wisdom here too, and the great Christian verities are never far away.

8s. 6d. net.

---

**THE EPWORTH PRESS**

25-35 City Road, London, E.C.1